

School of Theology at Claremont



1001 1399588

ECCLESIA DISCENS

---

A. W. HUTTON

ENGLISH PREACHERS



The Library  
SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY  
AT CLAREMONT

WEST FOOTHILL AT COLLEGE AVENUE  
CLAREMONT, CALIFORNIA

1<sup>d</sup> Tesets ani

;



ECCLESIA DISCENS



33  
7  
3

# ECCLESIA DISCENS

*Occasional Sermons and Adresses*

BY

ARTHUR WOLLASTON HUTTON, M.A.

RECTOR OF ST. MARY-LE-BOW, CHEAPSIDE

London:

FRANCIS GRIFFITHS

34 MAIDEN LANE, STRAND, W.C.

1904

Theology Library  
SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY  
AT CLAREMONT  
California



## PREFACE



THE title under which these sermons and addresses are published needs perhaps a word of explanation. A title of some kind or other is, I have been advised, absolutely necessary for a volume of sermons; and I think I am justified in departing from the usual practice of making the title of the sermon that comes first in the volume cover the whole book, because there is a certain unity of aim and idea in all that the present volume contains, and that is to show that the Church is a learner as well as a teacher, and would indeed have long ago failed in her mission as a teacher, if she had not all the while been learning. And the phrase, "*Ecclesia Discens*," which expresses this thought, has been in my mind pretty constantly ever since I saw, about six years ago, the way opened out before me to resume clerical work in the Church of England.<sup>1</sup> Whether the term originated in my own mind, or whether I had found it somewhere, I cannot say; at any rate, I cannot now recall

<sup>1</sup> In theological treatises, "*ecclesia discens*" means either the laity as contrasted with the clergy, or the laity and the inferior clergy as contrasted with the Pope and the bishops. But as the title to this volume I have of course given to the expression another significance.

where I found it ; but it seemed to me to express very serviceably a side of the truth necessary as counterbalancing, but not inconsistent with, the idea of the *Ecclesia Docens*, which was equally present in my mind in 1867, and for some fifteen or sixteen years afterwards. The general idea is not that the Church has everything to learn and nothing to teach, but that if she desires to include among her disciples men and women who see that they cannot with honesty reject those views of the growth of the world, and of man, and of religion, which modern knowledge insists upon, she must study those views herself, and must modify, so as to harmonise with them, not what is of the essence of her spiritual teaching about God and the soul, and the relation between them now and hereafter, but what can be recognised as an incrustation around that teaching, the deposit of ages when much that is now familiar was quite unknown. Readers of this volume will find, I fear, very little in it that is in the strict sense original ; and they may complain of sundry repetitions, which are due to the sermons having been preached to different audiences ; but they will also, I trust, find certain things stated with such simplicity and directness as may assist them towards the restoration of their faith, if such be their need—of a reasonable faith, I mean, none the less stimulating and inspiring because it is reasonable ; and what I contend for is that such a faith is not merely tolerated in the Church of England, but is demanded by her genius and history. It is for those who are interested in and desire such a restoration that this volume is published.

ARTHUR W. HUTTON.

16, THE GROVE, BLACKHEATH,  
June 1904.

# CONTENTS

## SERMONS

	PAGE
THE PRESENCE OF THE KINGDOM . . . . . Charterhouse, April 9, 1899.	1
THE RESTORATION OF FAITH . . . . . St. Margaret's, Westminster, June 18, 1899.	11
OUR FATHER'S KINGDOM . . . . . St. Paul's Cathedral, May 11, 1902.	21
VOCATION TO THE MINISTRY . . . . . Hereford Cathedral (Bishop's Ordination), May 25, 1902.	31
THE HEAVENLY VISION . . . . . Westminster Abbey, Jan. 25, 1903.	41
THE OLD TESTAMENT AND ITS CRITICS—I. . . . .	50
THE OLD TESTAMENT AND ITS CRITICS—II. . . . .	60
THE OLD TESTAMENT AND ITS CRITICS—III. . . . .	70
THE OLD TESTAMENT AND ITS CRITICS—IV. . . . . St. Luke's, Richmond, Advent, 1902.	81
AUTHORITY AND THE BIBLE . . . . . St. Stephen's, Walbrook, April 21, 1903.	92
THE SIGNIFICANCE OF ANGLICAN RITUAL . . . . . St. Stephen's, Walbrook, Feb. 2, 1904.	102

## ADDRESSES

	PAGE
THE RITSCHLIAN THEOLOGY AND ITS <del>RELATION TO</del> MYSTICISM	112
The Christo-Theosophical Society, March 7, 1899, and the Hornsey Society of Sacred Study, March 18, 1904.	
THE PERMANENT ELEMENT IN THEOLOGICAL RE-STATE- MENT	133
The Churchmen's Union, Jan. 30, 1902.	
CARDINAL NEWMAN, HIS WEAKNESS AND HIS STRENGTH.	149
St. Andrew's, Leytonstone, March 23, 1902.	
STATEMENT PREFATORY TO DECLARATION OF ASSENT	164
St. Mary-le-Bow, Cheapside, Oct. 10, 1903.	

# ECCLESIA DISCENS



## THE PRESENCE OF THE KINGDOM

“And when He was demanded of the Pharisees, when the kingdom of God should come, He answered them and said, The kingdom of God cometh not with observation: neither shall men say, Lo here! or, lo there! for, behold, the kingdom of God is within you.”—LUKE xvii. 20, 21.

I PROPOSE to speak to you a few words on a very old and a very familiar subject, the kingdom of God, or the kingdom of heaven; for though familiar, it is a subject on which there is always something fresh to learn. It belongs, in fact, to the very essence of our Christian profession. If that kingdom is established in our hearts, then we are Christ's indeed; if it is not so established, then I will not say that we are not Christ's at all, for we cannot altogether dissociate ourselves from Him even if we would; in Him as God “we live and move and have our being”; but we have yet a work to accomplish in recognising His presence and His kingdom, and our own relation to Him; and so far we are not yet Christ's as we should be.

It seems a simple and easy question to ask, What is the kingdom of God? What is the kingdom

of heaven? But we should be wise indeed if we knew all that was in the mind of our blessed Lord when He spoke on this subject. We can never know so much as that; but yet it is evident that there is much that we may learn, because it was so clearly His wish that His hearers should learn about it. On no other subject did He speak more frequently or more earnestly. Whatever we may know or think about it, evidently it meant a very great deal to Him. It was, in modern language, His favourite topic. In His public teaching He dwelt on it in the most emphatic manner. He used the expression as the most convenient heading under which to include those things which He knew to be of the greatest importance to His hearers. And although a very simple thing, it is clearly also a very comprehensive thing. The phrase implies, that although the whole universe of created things is, by the very fact of creation, God's kingdom, yet that man, God's highest work, has been and in some sense still is alienated from God; while amidst this alienation there is a process of restoration or recovery going forward, a process that has God for its author; and that they who have benefited by this restoring work are in a special sense citizens of this glorious kingdom. God is working in a peculiar hidden way, ruling and overruling, so as to bring men back to Him.

But alongside of this very simple idea we see also a great diversity of operation. For when our Lord proceeded to illustrate the idea of the kingdom by parables, He used similitudes so many and so various, that, whether we understand their full significance or no, one thing becomes clear: that the process of restoration is a broad and comprehensive one. He likened the kingdom of heaven

to a dozen different things, some of them very unlike each other. It was like the mustard-seed, like the leaven, like the net, like the pearl of great price, like the hidden treasure. He further illustrated the idea of the kingdom by the parables of the Sower, of the Unmerciful Servant, of the Labourers in the Vineyard, of the King's Supper, of the Ten Virgins, of the Ten Talents, and of the Sheep and the Goats. These are sufficiently varied to show how wide was the thought, as it existed in His mind; and if we take with these parables other incidental sayings of His about the kingdom, we shall find that, although in the main His teaching was that He had come to found that kingdom, and that by His presence and His teaching it had been founded, yet also it had had a past when He came, and that it would have a great and glorious future after He was gone; and further, that it has a certain ubiquity, so that in it even may be included many to whom His presence was never consciously vouchsafed. For, when He marvelled at the faith of the Gentile centurion at Capernaum, He spoke of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob as being "in the kingdom," thus extending its limits to the earlier dispensation; while He added that there were children privileged to belong to that kingdom who would, nevertheless, be displaced to make room for the many who would "come from the East and from the West," that is, from lands to which the special revelation to the Jews had not been extended, so that they too might sit down with Abraham and Isaac in that kingdom. This was indeed a most liberal widening of that doctrine of the kingdom of God which it was His special mission on earth to proclaim. But it cannot be said that He dwelt much on this extension. More

commonly He taught that the kingdom in its fulness had come only with Himself. Even John the Baptist, His forerunner, to whom He paid so high a tribute of praise, was not strictly within the kingdom as founded by the Incarnate Son. That great privilege was reserved for His own converted and baptized disciples. He commonly spoke, as in the words of my text, of the kingdom as already come: "no doubt the kingdom of God is come upon you"; it is "within you," or more correctly, perhaps, "in the midst of you." But further, He taught that in a sense it was still to come, and that, too, slowly and almost imperceptibly, certainly without any obvious outward show. He discouraged the idea that some had that "the kingdom of God should immediately appear," but He taught His disciples, and in them all His followers to the end of the world, to pray, "Thy kingdom come"; and when we pray those words we are reminded that, although God's kingdom is undoubtedly here already, and is, I trust, established in all our hearts, yet that much must be changed from what we see around us before it will have come in its fulness. As in the kingdom of nature, so in the kingdom of grace, evolution is gradual and progressive; and this thought is very plainly conveyed by some words that have been recorded only by St. Mark: "So is the kingdom of God, as if a man should cast seed into the ground, and should sleep and rise, night and day, and the seed should spring and grow up, he knoweth not how." Insensibly, while men pursue their ordinary avocations, and the earth swings round and round upon its axis, making the recurring phenomena of night and day, the seed of God's kingdom, in a manner to us unintelligible though familiar, just as is the case with the seed sown in



the ground, matures imperceptibly within the hearts of men who will one day be gathered in with the harvest of God's children, though as yet they may be barely conscious of that which is at work within. It is the law of spiritual evolution to be as a rule thus gradual; and its development extends over the whole of the time that there have lived men on this earth,—for from the first "He left not Himself without witness,"—and it will last until every soul has been garnered that God's love and patience can win; and His kingdom, let us remember, "is an everlasting kingdom, and His dominion endureth throughout all ages."

Some of the parables of the kingdom are clearly to be interpreted of what the Prayer-Book calls "the mystical Body of Christ, which is the blessed company of all faithful people"; that is to say, they refer to the Holy Catholic Church; while others are no less clearly to be interpreted of the spiritual life of the individual soul. To the latter class belong the parables of the Hidden Treasure and of the Pearl of Great Price. These and others deal unmistakably with the kingdom of God that is within us; while the former class, such as the parable of the Sower, the Mustard Seed, and the Tares, foreshadow the career of the Christian Church. Not that we should take them as if our Lord definitely foretold the Church's fortunes by way of prediction. It was a part of the limitations that witness to the great condescension of His incarnation, that our Lord as Son of Man predicted little or nothing. The only apparent exception to this is the prophecy of the destruction of Jerusalem; and even here He hardly did more than repeat and make His own those gloomy forebodings of the unbelieving city's future that prophets of

Israel had given utterance to in earlier days. The spirit in which we should sit at our Lord's feet, so as best to learn what He intended to convey by His parables, is not the spirit of those who looked for a sign either in miracle or in a prediction, but the spirit of those who perceived that "He knew what was in man." The secrets that from Him were not hidden were the secrets of human character, those would-be secrets of men who play the hypocrite all their life long and think that no one sees through them.

"The kingdom of God is within you." As you know, another and probably more accurate translation is given in the margin of your Bibles: "The kingdom of God is among you." If this should be the true sense of what our Lord said at this time, it deprives us indeed of this particular text as enforcing the truth that it is in the interior life of a man that God must rule if that man's religion is to be of any serious use to him; but it does not, of course, weaken or destroy that truth. There are plenty of other passages in Holy Scripture to illustrate and enforce it; indeed, it may be said that the supreme importance of private, personal religion is the theme of all that is loftiest in the Book of the Psalms, in the Gospels, and in the Epistles of St. Paul—of all, in short, that is most spiritual in the Word of God. It is in the souls of men that the secret of the kingdom is to be found. As an old writer once quaintly put it: "Let every man retire into himself and see if he can find this kingdom in his heart; for if he find it not there, in vain will he find it in all the world besides."

But if we take the words in that other sense, "The kingdom of God is among you," they are

applicable to our own times as well as to the time when our Lord spoke them. The Pharisees whom he addressed expected the kingdom to be ushered in with signs and wonders, with pomp and circumstance. That, He in these words would imply, is a fundamental error. It is of the very nature of this heavenly kingdom to come in quietness and without attracting observation. Men will be unable to say, Lo here! or Lo there! for it is "among you" at this very moment that I speak. Just as St. John the Baptist said, "There standeth One among you, Whom ye know not." John's preaching and habits of life had been of that vigorous and striking character that had made men wonder whether he himself was not the expected one, and not merely His forerunner. It was difficult for them, with their tone of mind and their high-strung anticipations of a conquering Messiah, to recognise Him in the gentle carpenter of Nazareth, who already for some thirty years had walked the earth unobtrusively among them. And we are all apt to fall into the same error. Living in a country and in an age in which Christian ideas have long been commonplaces, men who are beginning to feel dissatisfied with their spiritual condition (and such a feeling is usually the first sign of the working of Divine grace), such men are apt to look and hope for conversion by some striking and brilliant process of enlightenment that they will find it impossible to resist. But that is not usually God's way. We must bear in mind that the kingdom of God is "among us" already, made known in the Bible and in His Church, in service and in sacrament, and most of all in the holy lives of good Christian men and women. It is for us to realise this, and to lay hold of it, and to make it

our own, so as to be able to rejoice in the establishment of that kingdom within us. It was to the Pharisees that our Lord spoke at this time; and, without now dwelling on that which is commonly known and condemned as Pharisaism, we may note in passing that it is a special temper of mind of which there is always some danger, and that not the least for the best instructed Christians, just as the Pharisees were the best instructed Jews. It is the danger of neglecting the inward side of religion, the danger of being dominated by routine, of being punctual and scrupulous about all kinds of observances, which are indeed most useful and to some extent necessary, while the interior significance of it all, though known and admitted as the essential thing, is not actually realised by the soul. A wise teacher at Oxford, who died not many years ago, a man of great intellectual gifts combined with a sincerely religious and therefore unobtrusive temper, once put it in this way: "People find it easy to make the practices of religion their God, but what we have to do is to make God our religion."

"The Lord is King; the earth may be glad thereof." This outburst of joy is very intelligible when we remember what the establishment of this Divine kingdom in the heart of any man implies. Without rule, without a controlling influence, there is no order; and where there is no order there can be no permanent happiness. And we must not conceive of order or rule as merely external things. In human society, as men are now, external, even coercive, rule is indispensable. At any rate, it will be indispensable for many generations to come. The legislator, the judge, the magistrate, the policeman, all are necessary, and not merely

for the punishment of crime, but also for its prevention. But it is ultimately from the heart of man that disorder and dissension spring, and no external rule can control the heart. It is from hearts unrulèd by the Spirit of God that all the mischief comes ; and, as the kingdom of God is established in each man's heart—the process is a slow one, for God deals with men as individuals and not in crowds—but whenever it is thus established, then love, joy, peace, long-suffering, gentleness, patience, temperance, and truth have found a new home on earth, and a new centre whence their blessed influence may be diffused around. "The Lord is King" there ; and the harmony, sweetness, and light that flow from His interior rule are the just cause of joy among angels as well as among men. "Master, where dwellest Thou?" was the question of some disciples of the Baptist when first they came into the presence of Jesus ; and the words have recently been made the leading thought in some verses by the Bishop of Ripon, which I will read to you :—

"O Master of my soul, where dwellest Thou ?  
 For but one Sovereign doth love allow,  
 And if I find not Thee, quite lost am I.  
 Tell me Thy dwelling-place ; this is my cry.

No travel will I shrink, no danger dread,  
 If to Thy home, where'er it be, I may be led ;  
 Not where the world displays its golden pride,  
 Only with Him, who is the King, would I abide."

#### THE ANSWER.

"Nay, not in far distant lands, but ever near,  
 Near as the heart that hopes, or beats with fear ;  
 My home is in the heaven, and yet I dwell  
 With every human heart that loveth well.

## ECCLESIA DISCENS

Not where proud perils are I place my throne,  
But with the true of heart, and these alone;  
So, where the contrite soul breathes a true sigh,  
And where kind deeds are done, even there dwell I.

And those who live by love need never ask:  
They find my dwelling-place in every task.  
Vainly they seek who all impatient roam;  
If brave and good thy heart, there is My home."

## THE RESTORATION OF FAITH

“Canst thou by searching find out God?”—JOB xi. 7.

“Lord, show us the Father, and it sufficeth us.”—JOHN xiv. 8.

IN some verses entitled “Dover Beach,” Matthew Arnold, after describing the beauty of a moonlight night with a high tide, proceeded as follows:—

“The Sea of Faith  
Was once too at the full; and, round earth’s shore,  
Lay like the folds of a bright girdle furled.  
But now I only hear  
Its melancholy long withdrawing roar,  
Retreating, to the breath  
Of the night wind, down the vast edges drear,  
And naked shingles of the world.”

It is a fine and picturesque image this of the low tide of unbelief, and it doubtless expressed fully and sincerely the experience of the writer, who, though full of a faith and hope and love that well deserved to be called religious, had yet lost the theological faith in which in childhood he had been reared. He was speaking only for himself; but his words give expression to what has been the experience also of many of his contemporaries, though probably not of so large a proportion of them as he himself imagined. We are all of us apt, when we become convinced of the truth of some proposition newly come to our knowledge, or else of the erroneousness of some proposition that at one time we had held to be true, to think

that other people share, or ought to share, our new convictions. We assume that they do so, with very little evidence to support our assumption; or, if they assure us they do not, we are surprised at their dulness at not seeing things as we do; perhaps we are even disposed to suspect that they do really agree with us in secret, but lack the courage to declare themselves on our side. Certainly the writer of these lines was in error if he believed that his countrymen generally had experienced in their own souls this low tide of unbelief. We have indeed passed through and are still in a period of doubt and of difficulty, especially in regard to sundry theological outworks, to which perhaps too great importance has been attached; but the period to which I refer has been by no means a period of blank negation, in which men and women generally have heard the "melancholy long withdrawing roar" of a tide that had left exposed the "naked shingles of the world." This period, I think it can be shown, has not differed materially from others that have preceded it, in which men have half-despairingly asked the question, "Canst thou by searching find out God?" but it may be admitted that we do live in a somewhat sceptical age. But then scepticism properly means no more than "looking into things," and so may have an honourable significance. In a sense the men of Berea were sceptics when they were not content to receive the apostle's teaching without verification, "but searched the Scriptures daily, whether those things were so," and on that account were reckoned by St. Luke "more noble than those of Thessalonica." The sceptical temper is in fact a very different thing from the cynical temper; and it is largely justifiable in an age in which scientific research, and literary



criticism, and the comparative study of religions have shown that much in popular theology that was accepted fifty years ago without question is no longer tenable in a literal but only in an allegorical or spiritual sense. And it is surely a healthy sign that scepticism of this kind is nowadays neither concealed nor despised. Men who are good Christians and good Churchmen, recognising the gravity of social problems, and perceiving that the service of man is really the service of God, are willing nowadays to co-operate in good works with others whom they know to be neither Churchmen nor Christians, perhaps not even theists in any very definite sense; because a wider horizon has opened upon their view, and they realise that God is bound to no petty temporary system, but that just as He deals with His children in material things in sickness and in health, so in spiritual things He deals with them in their unbelief as well as in their faith, in their fall as well as in their regeneration, and that "no man is able to pluck them out of their Father's hand."

Not that this age despises theology; on the contrary, it is keenly interested in it; but it demands that it shall be scholarly and honest, so as to form a fitting framework for religion, which it rightly recognises as of vastly greater importance. And religion, it insists, should be of that genuine kind which St. James teaches us is acceptable to the Father, consisting in charity and in holiness rather than in mere external devotions: "to visit the fatherless and widows in their affliction, and to keep one's self unspotted from the world."

Now, if this be a true account of some of the religious characteristics of our age, then, although it is not an "age of faith," in the sense in which

we give that title to the thirteenth century, it is clearly not an age about which they who "love the Lord in sincerity and truth" need despair. In many ways it is far more spiritual than that which preceded it; and if the Positivist philosophy had not been founded fifty years ago, it may be taken as certain that it could not be called into existence now. Preaching before the University of Oxford in 1867, I remember how Dr. Pusey, addressing us in his affectionate way as his "sons," told us that even then "many clouds had rolled away, and that many more were still rolling away," clouds which at an earlier date had seemed likely to conceal the realities of the spiritual world, and to make darkness where there should be light. And, in a sense somewhat different from that which he probably intended, his words were true, and are truer still to-day. For during the last fifty years the conviction has been steadily growing among thoughtful men, that whether the theistic interpretation of the origin and purpose of the universe be true or not, there is no other interpretation; and, on the other hand, they who hold to this interpretation have implicitly or explicitly agreed to abandon many untenable positions, the attempted defence of which tended to obscure the central citadel of the faith, which is the revelation of the Father in Christ and in the Spirit of Christ. For here lies the answer to the cry of the human soul dimly conscious that it has a Father, its Creator, and that it can only find rest in finding Him; the answer both to the older cry, not unmixed with despair, "Canst thou by searching find out God?" and also to the newer appeal, made in simplicity in the presence of God to God Himself, "Lord, show us the Father, and it sufficeth us." "Have I been so

long time with you, and yet hast thou not known Me, Philip? He that hath seen Me hath seen the Father."

And indeed, that older question, "Canst thou by searching find out God?" is one that always must be answered in the negative, if it is implied that the search is purely intellectual. The scrutinising glance of the keenest anatomist has never yet discovered, and never will discover, traces of the seat of the departed human soul; and across the field of the most powerful astronomical telescope no angel has ever been, or ever will be, seen to pass. Although the whole universe be pervaded by the presence of God, and is in fact "the garment that we see Him by," yet neither here nor hereafter is He, or will He be, visible Himself to our carnal eyes; it is only by the soul's convictions of things eternal—of love, of holiness, and of duty—that He can in any sense be said to be seen. Nor are any other proofs of His existence, whether scientific or philosophical, really cogent, save to those to whom the truth is already known by the reasonings of the heart that cannot be expressed in words. Such convincing reasonings have formed part of the experience of the human race; not indeed of every individual, nor even of the favoured individuals at every moment of their existence; but sufficiently universal and adequately recorded to be a guide to those who, as "holy and humble men of heart," seek the Lord in the way that He may be found. Some, indeed, who have heard the inward voice have preferred to speak of it indefinitely, as "a something not ourselves that makes for righteousness"; but surely the word "God," which means the same thing, is handier, and is the better one to use; and we must conclude that either the majority of the

best men and women who have ever lived are deceivers, which is absurd, or else that nothing is more certain than that throughout the history of the world God has spoken, whether "by the prophets," who have felt impelled either in vocal utterance or in writing to tell forth what they have heard, or else in "a still small voice" to the faithful souls, to whom indeed He still speaks, and will not cease to speak so long as men dwell on this earth.

For, as Lowell has well expressed it—

"God is not dumb, that He should speak no more;  
 If thou hast wanderings in the wilderness,  
 And find'st not Sinai, 'tis thy soul is poor:  
 There towers the mountain of the voice no less,  
 Which whoso seeks shall find; but he who bends  
 Intent on manna still, and mortal ends,  
 Sees it not, neither hears its thundered lore.

Slowly the Bible of the race is writ,  
 And not on paper leaves, nor leaves of stone;  
 Each age, each kindred, adds a verse to it,  
 Texts of despair or hope, of joy or moan.  
 While swings the sea, while mists the mountains shroud,  
 While thunder's surges burst on cliffs of cloud,  
 Still at the prophet's feet the nations sit."

And of course, at the feet of one Prophet in particular. For, while we are learning to "see God in all things," or, perhaps more accurately, to "see all things in God," and while we are learning that the dignity of the human spirit justifies us in describing all men—daring even to include ourselves—as "children of God"—for we have the highest warrant for applying to mankind the words in the 82nd Psalm, "I have said ye are gods and ye are all the children of the Most High"—yet we are learning also more profoundly every day that in an unique sense is to be ascribed to Jesus of Nazareth the title of the Incarnate Son of God.

And here let me pay a tribute of recognition to the theologian who, dying some ten years ago, had devoted the last thirty years of his strenuous life to inculcating the truth that the way back to God for an age that had ceased to regard godlessness as a serious evil, must be through each man perceiving the value to his own soul of the revelation of God manifest in the flesh, which he will find in the historical records of the life of Jesus Christ. For although, both as Englishmen and as English Churchmen, it is impossible for us to subscribe to every line in the teaching of the teacher to whom I refer, Albrecht Ritschl, who as a German and a Lutheran says many things that both in form and in substance cannot fail to be unacceptable to us, yet we owe to him and to his disciples, the foremost Christian apologists of this our day, a great debt of gratitude for having set forth so cogently, and in a method so well calculated to command the attention of thoughtful men, what might otherwise have seemed a doctrine too old-fashioned to be worth studying afresh, namely, that "there is none other Name given among men in which they may find salvation."

His influence has in Germany already been immense, and it is bearing fruit there in a great Christian reaction; it is considerable also, I believe, in America; and if his name and his teaching are less known among ourselves, this is partly because there is happily less need for his apologetic system in our own country, and partly because we are always slow to assimilate ideas that have originated in other lands. Elaborate—needlessly and injuriously elaborate—as are the details of the Ritschlian theology, the leading idea is simplicity itself. It is this: that men who have lost their

hold on God must be led back to the Father through Christ in the way in which the first Christians were led. Ritschl shows that when criticism, higher or lower, has done all that it possibly can do, there still remains, as the central and most attractive figure in the world's history, Jesus of Nazareth, mirrored in His unique personality and character in the literature of the New Testament, while the literature of the Old Testament forms a kind of pedestal on which He stands. To this Figure he urges us to draw nigh, acknowledging first of all, as indeed all men must do, that nowhere else can we find anything more interesting and attractive. This attitude of interest will lead, he thinks, gradually to what may be termed friendliness, and this again will develop into reverence; and so the process will go forward, not hurriedly indeed, but by stages such as those through which the first disciples passed, until like them we reach convictions of the immense value to ourselves of the presence and teaching of this sweet and solemn Master; and words rise to our lips, such as rose to those of other men eighteen hundred years ago, men favoured by personal knowledge of His actual appearance and of the very tone of His voice, such as we cannot have: "Never man spake like this man"; "Truly this was a Son of God"; "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God"; "My Lord and my God." And in this religious experience, of which, as being a thing within our own direct personal consciousness, we can be perfectly certain—more certain than we could be of any external revelation obtained by submission to the authority of either Church or Bible claiming infallibility—we perceive that we have attained to the knowledge of the Father. "Lord, show us the Father, and it sufficeth

us." "Have I been so long time with you, and yet hast thou not known Me, Philip? He that hath seen Me hath seen the Father." For the Father is consubstantial with the Son.

To some of you, ideas such as these may seem so elementary and undogmatic as to be almost painful in their bareness. But I would ask you to bear in mind that I am not speaking now from the point of view of those who have never even felt tempted to relax their hold on the fully detailed system of creed and of worship in which they have been educated from childhood. I am pleading for the gentle and generous treatment of those who look wistfully towards that home of faith and love in which you are privileged to dwell, but who would inevitably be deterred from entering it if you confronted them first of all with formal statements of dogma or with anything else that may conveniently be summarised by the word "ecclesiasticism." All that it is necessary for a Christian to believe and to practise for his soul's health comes in due course, after the great act of faith in Christ as the manifestation of God to us has been made. That having been made the possession of a man's soul, it then becomes natural and easy for him to believe that the beginning and the ending of so unique a life were characterised by some departure from that which is normal in the case of ordinary human beings; whereas to insist on the acceptance of the miraculous, as a condition prior to any useful study of the life and words of Christ, is to throw back the sensitive inquirer and possible disciple, even though it be quite true to say that science is far less positive now than it was thirty years ago in treating the miraculous and the impossible as synonymous terms. And similarly, ideas as to the inspiration of Scripture,

the authority of the Church, the value of the Sacraments, the work of the ministry, the efficacy of prayer—all these come in their proper order, and will be understood and accepted in so far as there is need; but it is inconsiderate and imprudent to insist upon them before the foundation has been "well and truly laid." In this our Church of England, at any rate, men are not expected to accept an elaborate system by one act of submission to authority. We have "not so learned Christ," nor did He so reveal Himself either to or through His first disciples and apostles.

And last of all, let me remind you that this finding of the Father through Christ, who is the Door, is the reality that it undoubtedly is, because it is a communion of spirit with Spirit. The kingdom of God thus established in the heart comes "not by observation" nor by hearsay, but by the direct apprehension and intuition of the God-loving soul, recognising its Creator and its End. "Eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, neither have entered into the heart of man the things which God hath prepared for them that love Him. But God hath revealed them unto us by His Spirit."



## OUR FATHER'S KINGDOM

“After this manner therefore pray ye : Our Father, . . . Thy kingdom come.”—*MATT.* vi. 9, 10.

IT is a commonplace to say that often we take no notice of that which is under our very eyes. It is in fact a part of wisdom to perceive the significance of that which we see every day. Things to which we are accustomed, things which we habitually hear mentioned day by day, make little or no impression upon us. And so it was at the very beginning of the ministry of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. We know next to nothing of the first thirty years of His life, so far as any details are concerned, but of this we cannot fail to be assured, that both in youth and in early manhood it was a life of moral perfection ; and yet, it had attracted no attention. The very day before His baptism in the river Jordan, it is recorded that the Baptist said of Him, “There standeth one among you, Whom ye know not.” Even the prophetic forerunner himself admits that he had not recognised the greatness and the mission of Jesus until a special inspiration had pointed Him out : “I knew Him not : but He that sent me to baptize with water, the same said unto me, Upon whom thou shalt see the Spirit descending, and remaining on Him, the same is He which baptizeth with the Holy Ghost. And I saw, and bare record that this is the Son of God.” Perhaps we may take it

as a witness to the generally high moral standard among the boys and young men in Galilee at that date, that the holy life of Jesus up to the age of thirty years should have attracted no attention, should have excited no wonder; certainly in our own day, and in our own land, it is hardly conceivable that any such life should be lived—so pure, so gentle, so unworldly, so unselfish—without being remarked upon, and becoming publicly known, as making so sharp a contrast with the lives of all others around. But however that may have been, the fact remains that His perfect life attracted no attention, and left the eternal significance of His personality unrecognised. John the Baptist, indeed, could say of Him with due humility, "His shoe's latchet I am not worthy to unloose"; but still, amidst the multitudes whom the stings of conscience had driven forth to John's baptism, there He stood, one with whom the dwellers in and about Nazareth must have been familiar, but whom they knew not.

And as at the beginning, so it was at the end. That which we should have thought must have become most familiar to the Master's disciples, the idea of the "kingdom of God," was still misunderstood by them. It had been preached by the Baptist; it had been preached by Himself; its nature had been indicated in a score or more of parables; its inwardness and its catholicity were the implications of nearly all that He had been saying during the years that He had devoted to the active service of man. And yet, when the hour had come for His withdrawal into the unseen, when His life was henceforth to be known within and was no longer to be manifested without, the very last words recorded to have been said to Him

by His most intimate disciples were these: "Lord, wilt Thou at this time restore again the kingdom to Israel?" He had taught them to pray, "Our Father, . . . Thy kingdom come," and the spiritual nature of that kingdom had all along held the foremost place in His teaching; if anything was clear and familiar to them, it surely must have been that; and yet they aspire no higher after all than to the restoration of the temporal kingdom of the Jews. The kingdom of God was "within them," or, better perhaps, was "in the midst of them"; no external phenomena were to herald its advent, for indeed it had come already, and that without observation; but yet, in spite of this, they must fall back on prejudices in favour of a certain race and of a certain form of government. Their minds did not rise higher than to a material temporal throne from which the twelve tribes of Israel would be judged, those tribes who were related to have worn out the patience of Moses in olden times, and whose stubbornness was at that very date wearing out the patience of their Roman conquerors.

What then was, what is that kingdom, the true nature of which they were so slow to understand, and which we perhaps are equally slow to appreciate, though it is in the midst of us at this day, and is witnessed to by many converging lines of proof, though no proof of it is really convincing unless it be an interior one? What is the kingdom of God? What is the kingdom of heaven? What is that for which we pray when we say, "Our Father, . . . Thy kingdom come"? In a sense, in a limited sense, it is a "restoration"; in a wider and farther-reaching sense it is a development; it is a part of the process, the Divine process, of

evolution. It is a restoration, because we cannot conceive of God as being the Author of evil as such, and the kingdom of God has for its aim the restoration in each soul of that Divine image and likeness in which it was created, but which the prevalence of sin has marred. The fall of man by sin has from the very first been practically coincident with the consciousness of the possession of free will, and this fall has by inheritance affected almost every child of man, and has been contributed to by almost every child of man that has known how to choose between good and evil; but none the less it is true of every one of us that "heaven lies about us in our infancy," that "not in utter nakedness, but trailing clouds of glory do we come from God, Who is our home"; and thus it is an aim of the kingdom of God when established within us to restore us to that which we were, in at least the original idea of our creation. But while it is true that the kingdom thus looks back to restore something that had been lost, it is also true that more markedly it looks forward to secure, by way of development, a "life of the world to come," that is to say, a supernatural life, begun here, but consummated in a future which for want of a better word we call "eternal"; the idea of it being one that necessarily transcends our comprehension.

People are sometimes rather afraid of that word "supernatural"; but yet, in relation to the progress of evolution, it means no more than a stage that has not yet been reached. If it had been possible for any of us with our present intelligence but without our present knowledge to have watched the process by which the world has reached its present stage of development, we should have regarded as supernatural the molten stage of exist-

ence if this had been foretold to us while it was still in the stage of intensely heated vapour ; so should we also have regarded the possibility of life while the molten stage continued ; so also the possibility of consciousness while life was yet in its humblest beginnings. All these things have been supernatural in their day, but they are so now no longer. And when the Spirit strives within you now, bidding you to be unselfish, to love that which is good though hard to attain, to hate that which is evil though it is charming and seductive and within easy reach, to set a high value on the unseen and to think lightly of things material and temporal, then there is affecting you the divinely implanted impetus towards a life which in our present stage is supernatural, but which will be recognised as supernatural no longer when that kingdom for which this longing bids us pray has finally and definitely and completely come. And though the advent of this spiritual kingdom has had its witnesses from the earliest times in the East, and was more definitely anticipated some centuries before Christ by that Semitic race which, despite its waywardness and perverseness, was more fully inspired than any other race with the thought of the eternal value of righteousness, yet not until the incarnation of Him whose ascension into the realm of faith we have just been celebrating, not until the coming of the uniquely-begotten Son of God, was the kingdom of His Father definitely established on earth. It needed His revelation of the Father to accomplish this ; it needed His endowment of the kingdom with spiritual power to guarantee its permanent life on earth ; but thenceforward, with the history of the world stamped by the Christian era, His kingdom, in spite of local and temporary relapses

and failures, was to be what it is for us now, the ante-chamber of a King whose dominion is everlasting and progressive throughout all ages. And His kingdom is established within us if we are consciously striving towards its progress here and its consummation hereafter.

It has recently been said that science which fifty years ago was agnostic, if not definitely atheistic, has lately become religious, and that the lesson of evolution is now a lesson in theism. We may take this to be substantially true but yet an exaggeration of the truth. It is not the business of science either to teach theism or to deny it; and these its limitations it has latterly come to recognise more clearly, so that it can no longer be either claimed or feared as hostile to theism. The lesson of evolution is not so much that God exists, as that God, of Whose existence we are assured on other grounds, is marvellous in His patience, and is willing that ages upon ages should roll on while, amidst the clash of existing natural forces, the germs of that which is as yet supernatural should be developed. Certainly we are for the moment struck with perplexity by a sharp and obvious contrast, when we read in our daily paper of thousands of human lives being sacrificed in a few moments in a terrible volcanic outburst in the West Indies, and then turn to the pages of the sacred Book and read that no sparrow even falls to the ground but by our Heavenly Father's will, and that the very hairs of our head are numbered. The contrast between the profession of minute and tender care and the apparent recklessness of the destruction is undeniable; but yet our perplexity in contemplating it is due surely to the limitations of our knowledge, and to our proneness to imagine God to be "such an one as

ourselves," quite as much as to our failure to recognise that the element of uncertainty is an important, even an indispensable, factor in our moral probation, and that the difficulty involved is really the same when one man dies unexpectedly as it is when thousands are involved in the same sudden catastrophe. We cannot judge by any human standard the working of the Eternal by general laws, but we can at any rate use this striking illustration of the uncertainty of life as an occasion for drawing nearer to Him in Whom, though He slay us, we know that we must trust. We must not count them as "sinners above all others" on whom the tower of Siloam fell; but their destruction should stimulate our conscience to recognise our own desert of a similar penalty except we repent.

How then shall you, any of you, who feel that you as yet stand outside God's kingdom, how shall you be brought within it? For one thing, do not regard yourselves as isolated if you are conscious of this need. Your need is in a measure our need, the need of all. The greatest saint, when he prays, "Our Father, . . . thy kingdom come," interprets his prayer as inclusive, as inclusive of himself, and he means that it must come more fully, more efficaciously, to control his own heart and life. We are then praying this prayer all together; and be assured that you are not outside this kingdom, if only your will is to be within it. And then, to strengthen and confirm this faith which is yours in germ already, it is better to look within than to look without. The philosopher Immanuel Kant found, no doubt, inspiration in the starry heavens above as well as in the moral law within. And all of us may be influenced and strengthened by the external evidence of the kingdom of God, whether

it be the order and beauty and variety and fitness of nature, or whether it be of God in human history ; as indeed His footsteps are visible there. But these things belong rather to the realm of inference than of proof by way of argument ; and they come well enough in confirmation and in illustration of that which has already been accepted as certain on other grounds. For even in the incomprehensible beauty of nature, perhaps the most eloquent of the external witnesses to God, there lacks the element that brings conviction. There is truth, we must confess, in the words of Samuel Taylor Coleridge—

“ It were a vain endeavour  
That I should gaze for ever  
On that green light that lingers in the West.  
I may not hope from outward forms to win  
The passion and the life whose fountains are within.”

It is within, then, that we must look ; and yet even the moral law within, the voice of conscience itself, can somehow be explained away as the creation of habit and of inheritance, so as to fail to produce conviction, unless that most precious possession is illuminated by an experience of the Divine life immediately our own. God “ guides us with His eye,” and the eye of our soul must, so to speak, “ catch ” His. Happily, this does not need to be taught to the vast majority of men ; for they who already see clearly, gain nothing in that respect when the theory of sight is explained to them. And this is generally the privilege of those who are “ brought up in the faith and fear of God’s holy Name ” ; as it is also the privilege of those who have not so been trained, but who, in maturer years, when first they hear of Christ and of the kingdom



of heaven, enter it with the simplicity and trustfulness of little children, accepting without demur what is taught them by the Church from the pages of Holy Scripture.

Is, then, God's kingdom securely and adequately established in this our "Church and realm" of England, of which this great building in which we are assembled to-night is for practical purposes the spiritual centre? We know that it is not so, even if we look no farther afield than this. We know that our land is stained by national vices, arrogance, intemperance, and other immorality, such as are prohibitive to the growth of our Father's kingdom. We know that the hand of the would-be social reformer is often paralysed by the indifference of the Legislature; we know how often a cynical Pharisaism prevails over and chills down the aspirations and the enthusiasm of those who long to make their love of God take shape in some practical work. These things are doubtless discouraging; but it is often just in the hour of discouragement that the presence of Christ is revealed. In his sonnet entitled "East London," Matthew Arnold has recorded how the preacher, overworked and ill, whom he met in Bethnal Green, assured him that just at such a time he had been "cheered with thoughts of Christ, the Living Bread." That is an element, and surely a supernatural element, in that kingdom for whose coming we pray, that it has a strength which enables it to triumph over (and even because of) disappointments and apparent failures. And it has this special feature and characteristic, because it is the kingdom of a God made man for us and for our salvation, working out that salvation for us amidst sorrow, suffering, contempt, and death, that having shared our miseries we

might also have our share in His victory. For the reign of such a conqueror as this, one with the Father Whom He came to reveal, we pray when we say, "Our Father, . . . Thy kingdom come."

## VOCATION TO THE MINISTRY

“I heard the voice of the Lord, saying, Whom shall I send, and who will go for us? Then said I, Here am I; send me.”  
—ISA. vi. 8.

“Ye shall be witnesses unto Me.”—ACTS i. 8.

THE vision of Isaiah, although found in the Old Testament, and belonging indeed to an early stage in the history of the spiritual progress of God's chosen people, is not without points of contact with the fuller revelation contained in the New Testament. It includes in the words, “Holy, Holy, Holy,” a forecast of the doctrine of the Holy Trinity, of that mysterious Threeness in the unity of God which is to-day especially brought before our hearts and minds for our devout and reverent meditation; and in the incident of the white-hot coal taken by one of the seraphim from off the altar and placed upon the prophet's lips, the mystical writers have always seen a figure of the Holy Communion, the sacred gift bringing pardon and peace to those who receive it in humility, repentance, and faith. True it is that the vision of God in His glory was not to the prophet altogether a “beatific vision,” and so may seem to be in contrast with the beatitude pronounced on the “pure in heart,” to whom the vision of God is blessedness. But the contrast is more apparent than real. True, he cried, not “Blessed am I,” but “Woe is me, for mine eyes have seen the King, the Lord of Hosts.” But the

source of his terror was not in the actual vision of God, but in the prophet's consciousness of his own moral unfitness for the vision. It made him realise the foulness of his own sinful state, and also the foulness of what in modern language we should call his "environment." "I am a man of unclean lips," he cried, "and I dwell in the midst of a people of unclean lips." And this we may fitly parallel with what we read in the Gospel of St. Peter's cry, "Depart from me, for I am a sinful man, O Lord," when he had first realised his Master's presence and power. Peter, too, was pardoned after his lips had been made unclean by the denial of his Master at a later time; and to him was intrusted the active service of feeding and tending the sheep and lambs of Christ's flock; and as Isaiah's vision proceeded, his humility similarly found a prompt reward in his cleansing and redemption. The live coal from off the altar (a symbol, at any rate, of the burning love of God) was placed on those lips, the uncleanness of which he had confessed and lamented, and "their iniquity was purged and their sin was taken away," and the pardoned prophet, learning next in his vision that the Lord on the throne needed a messenger to do Him some service, cried eagerly, that he might not fail to obtain this office and ministry, "Here am I, send me"; the whole being thus a figure of that which occurs daily under the dispensation of the gospel, whenever anywhere throughout the world a sinful man is brought to the knowledge of God in Christ, and with the vision of God before him and the experience of pardon and of hope in his soul, prays earnestly to be given something to do in his Master's service. The vision of God inspires energy and zeal. "Here am I, send me."

It is true of ~~us~~ all, clergy and laity alike, that if the touch of God is anything to us at all, it means that we must arise and do something in His service; and all can find something to do. But the thought that Isaiah's vision presents to us with such inspiring force is especially thus presented to those who are to-day being called, here or elsewhere, to any office or administration in the Church of God; and so to them more especially, and to others of the clergy assembled in this cathedral church to-day, I will now address what I have on this occasion to say concerning some of the privileges which reward, and some of the perils which beset, an ordained minister of Christ.

Our credentials are twofold, vocation and ordination, the one interior and the other external; and among the temptations which affect the clergy at this time there is a peculiarly subtle one, to make little of vocation and to make much of ordination. It is subtle, because it comes to us in the guise of humility. It suggests to us that in virtue, not of any merits of our own, but by the consecrating touch of the bishop's hands, we have been endued with supernatural powers such as no mere layman possesses. To that temptation we shall best turn a deaf ear by recalling what our relation to the Christian layman really is. That royal priesthood which we exercise is also his, and we exercise it rather as his delegate than as his superior. It is a matter of order, of "holy orders," if you prefer so to express it, that we take the lead in the service of God; but let us remember that as ~~clergymen~~ *ministers* we are "the servants of the servants of God," and let us beware of that exaggeration of the distinction between clergy and laity, which is for us in the Church of England most assuredly one of the temp-

tations of our day. For a well-regulated Church life ordination is an indispensable necessity, and we cannot doubt that for us in England it has been a peculiar blessing that the ancient episcopal organisation of the Church continued throughout the storm and stress of the Reformation, and secured for us a certain likeness with the Church of the old Saints and Fathers, such as some of the Reformed Churches have lost. But if ordination as a method of Church life is indispensable, so is vocation indispensable as a guarantee of spiritual life. "No man taketh this honour unto himself except he be called." The bishop and his advisers had already before our ordination judged concerning us that we had received this call, so that without scruple or anxiety, we could answer affirmatively to the question, "Do you think in your heart that you are truly called to the order and ministry of a priest or a deacon?" as the case might be. But God's call is a somewhat precarious as well as a very precious thing; and we may for a time, or even permanently, forfeit its sanctifying power, if we become careless or indifferent about it. Vocation is what I have called our "interior credential." In itself it is (to quote the language of Catholic theology), "an act of God's supernatural providence, whereby He makes choice of certain men and endows them with the qualities requisite to enable them to fulfil the duties of their ministry, and further inspires them with a holy zeal for the ecclesiastical state, and for their own personal sanctification to God's own honour and glory." Vocation as the "interior credential" has no legal or material value. It does not qualify for any benefice or other position. But it does enable us, if we cherish it after we have received it, and

continue to cherish it throughout our ministerial career, to do our duty in that state of life into which it has pleased God to call us. That state of life has special privileges, but it has also special temptations, amidst some of which it is surely wonderful that the clergy do not more frequently fall; temptations partly due to our finding ourselves suddenly placed in a position, confidential and familiar, in virtue of our office, with whole classes of persons with whom in our former life we were hardly brought into contact at all; and partly due to that authority which people recognise as having been entrusted to us. And in such times of temptation, what can better help us than this "grace of vocation," as we may term it, this divinely implanted instinct which at such a time bids us to "walk worthy of the vocation wherewith we are called with all lowliness and meekness"? Surely we should make much of the consciousness of God's vocation, which is for us clergymen our most precious possession. And it has this other advantage over ordination, the external credential, that it is not a matter of controversy. It is true that at the Reformation there were those who held that it was for the church or congregation, and not for the bishop, to verify the fact of vocation in each particular case, and that this was the ancient ecclesiastical rule; but this was a comparatively unimportant detail; while all Christian communities—Roman, Greek, Anglican, and Protestant—are agreed in this, that God's vocation is a real and an essential thing; and what better testimony can we have to the continued presence of the living Christ among His people than this fact, that year after year, in spite of all difficulties and discouragements, often it would almost seem by way of welcoming them, young

men just entering on the most active, and probably the most productive years of their life, are empowered to stand up before God and the congregation and to say, "I do believe in my heart that God has called me thus to serve Him in the Church of Jesus Christ our Lord."

Vocation is thus that which unites what the Prayer-Book calls "the blessed company of all faithful people"; while ordination, by which that vocation is officially blessed and sealed, instead of being, as it should be, a sacrament of unity, is unhappily at the present time just that which more than anything else divides Christians into camps unable or unwilling to co-operate with one another. Who can doubt, when seeing their good works and their earnest, self-denying lives, but that among the Roman Catholic clergy, and also the clergy of the non-Episcopal churches, there are many whom God has called into the ministry, and whose ministry He blesses, though they have not been admitted to it by the same ordination as our own? while from both classes we are cut off mainly by differences in regard to the form of ordination; the Roman Catholic Church rejecting our orders as not adhering to the high sacerdotal standard set up in the Middle Ages, while we in turn at present reject the orders of Presbyterians and others, as not having been conferred by a bishop. It is in no controversial spirit that I refer to these differences—on an occasion like the present it is best to lay all controversy aside—but I do so because I think there are hopes and signs that a better spirit is now in the air, and may ere long prevail, and that this great obstacle to reunion may in course of time be removed. For in the long run it is inevitable that scholarship, sound learning, a fuller knowledge of the facts,



and a juster estimate of their significance, must prevail over misconceptions which rest on imperfect knowledge and cause divisions. And certainly during the last twenty years, through the discovery of fresh documents and the clearer understanding of old documents in their light, a better knowledge concerning the Christian ministry in apostolic and primitive times is at our disposal, if we care to use it. The well-known sentence in the Preface to our Ordinal, concerning the apostolic originalness of the orders of bishops, priests, and deacons, though literally true in point of fact, would hardly be so bluntly stated by any modern scholar as a sufficient warrant for our continuing orders thus named as holy orders now, for it is now generally recognised that in the most primitive times not only the deacons but also the bishops and presbyters were officers charged with the temporal administration of the churches, while the sacred duties of the ministry, for the proper discharge of which bishops, priests, and deacons are now ordained, were performed by apostles, prophets, evangelists, pastors, and teachers, whose office is by some described as a "ministry of grace," and by others as a "ministry of enthusiasm," and whose duties in the main were later taken in hand by the Church officials bearing the names now so familiar to us; were "inherited by default," perhaps we may say, for there is little or nothing to show that the transference was effected by any rite of ordination. And if these things are so, and if, further, there is evidence at a later date of ordination recognised as duly conferred by presbyters, it is not wonderful that one of our bishops, distinguished for his ecclesiastical spirit as much as for his scholarship, should recently have held out an olive-branch, sure to be carried

much farther before long, indicating a certain preparedness to recognise the validity of the orders conferred in the Established Church of Scotland. A movement of this kind, a movement that has spiritual reunion for its end, comes, you may feel sure of it, from God; and it will grow and gain strength, and in course of time, though it must be a long time, it will influence even the ancient Churches of the East and of Rome; so that finally, with other changes accompanying, there will be opened up at least the possibility for the actual reunion in "one fold" and "under one Shepherd" of all those who "love the Lord in sincerity and truth.")

(And to hasten this day we need more and more to realise that of the two credentials of the ministry, vocation and ordination, the former is the greater; that it is God's immediate work to choose, to call, and to empower; while to the Church belongs the minor duty, necessary though secondary, to verify and to ordain.

"Henceforth I call you not servants, for the servant knoweth not what his Lord doeth; but I have called you friends; for all things that I have heard of My Father I have made known unto you. Ye have not chosen Me, but I have chosen you, and ordained you, that ye should go and bring forth fruit, and that your fruit should remain." These words, which have been incorporated into the office in the Roman Pontifical for the ordination of priests, are more than any other in Holy Scripture indicative of the close personal relationship which exists or should exist between Christ, our Master, and those of us whom He has chosen and called into His sacred ministry. The choice is not ours but His. We are His "friends," not by our own merits

but by His condescension ; and what nobler title can any man hope to bear than this, "a friend of Christ," a "friend of God"? But friendship, let us remember, is not the growth of a moment, it is the result of long-continued and intimate association ; and friendship, let us also remember, must, in Dr. Johnson's phrase, be "kept in repair." As friends in this sense of God and of Christ, and of Him "who spake by the prophets," we stand on firm ground—

"When this day of surging thought  
Brings all sanctities to question,  
And all hollow faiths to nought."

There are many, for example, who view with sincere alarm the wider acceptance by the clergy of what may be called the historical account of the origin and growth into their present form of the books of Holy Scripture. They fear that faith in God and in revelation will disappear as the human and imperfect element in the Bible is more freely acknowledged by us. But that is hardly the case. If God has revealed Himself to us, and if we in response to that revelation have cried out to Him, "Here am I, send me," and amidst much weakness and failure have clung to that allegiance and that service, and have been rewarded by His smile of recognition as His "friends," then we have no occasion to fear, if the records of the experience of those to whom of old He revealed Himself more plainly are found to have become associated with accretions, such as form no integral part of the revelation, and are altogether of inferior value. We may have difficulty, no doubt, in bringing others to see these things as we see them ; but our own faith will remain unaffected, as based on the con-

sciousness that God is, and has spoken to us through Christ. In that light mainly, though also of course in every light that the Church and the Bible provide for us, we must be "witnesses unto Him." How shall we be witnesses unless we ourselves first have seen? How shall we preach unless we know that we ourselves are sent? To-day's ordination service provides an answer to these questions. God has called us to be His ministers; and if we are duly "bound on earth" to this vocation, this binding is ratified in heaven whence the call first came. And to be His faithful witnesses we must "approve ourselves" as the ministers of God, "giving no offence in anything"; and (if not called upon like the apostle to endure afflictions, stripes, imprisonments, and tumults) at any rate bearing our testimony "by pureness, by knowledge, by long-suffering, by kindness, by the Holy Ghost, by love unfeigned."

## THE HEAVENLY VISION

“Last of all, He was seen of me also, as of one born out of due time.”—1 COR. xv. 8.

“Whereupon, O King Agrippa, I was not disobedient unto the heavenly vision.”—ACTS xxvi. 19.

ST. PAUL, the Apostle of the Gentiles, whose wonderful conversion our Calendar commemorates to-day, is beyond question the most interesting and attractive personality depicted to us in the pages of the New Testament. In no other case are we brought so closely into touch with an actual man with characteristics so distinct. His position, too, in relation to the other apostles is remarkable, and it resembles to some extent that of a Nonconformist in relation to an Established Church. We have his splendid assertions of independence of all authority save that of his Divine Master; we have, in the famous scene at Antioch, his outspoken declaration of his “conscientious objection” to anything like compromise in regard to the alleged obligation of the old Jewish observances, a scene in which we cannot fail to be surprised at finding St. Peter playing a part which we should more naturally associate with some suave and temporising ecclesiastic of much later years. And further, we find it recorded, as if in justification of his claim to an apostolic mission, independent of anything that would now be called “Apostolic Succession,” that the hands laid on him when he was to be “separ-

ated for the work whereunto he was called," were not those of the apostles, but of "certain prophets and teachers" whose names are otherwise unknown, and whose authority thus to act was evidently only temporary. On evidence such as this—and it is confirmed by language used by the apostle himself in his earlier Epistles—it is justifiable to hold that the position of St. Paul in the earliest Church was one of exceptional freedom, and was, as I said, not without correspondence to the position of a Non-conformist minister in our own day; though certainly, as time went on, if we may take the later Epistles as authentic, he less and less asserted any independence, and became more closely associated with such organisation as the Church at that time possessed; and finally, as the legend goes, by his association with St. Peter in martyrdom, on the same day and in the same city of Rome, he became recognised by tradition as a co-founder with St. Peter of the Church at Rome, and the two were commemorated on the same day (the 29th of June), which, until the date of the Reformation, was in our Church of England, as well as elsewhere, the Feast of St. Peter and of St. Paul.

But now, leaving matters of this kind on one side, let us inquire what was the secret of this great and strenuous life, to which more than to any other our Western world owes the fact that it is Christian? Whence did this comparatively independent labourer in the Master's vineyard obtain the force that enabled him to accomplish such things? How was it that he "laboured more abundantly" than the rest? They had been privileged, in a way that he was not, to hold three years' close companionship with their Lord. To St. Paul the Master appeared, more than once, it would seem, but as a

kind of afterthought, "as to one born out of due time"; but then "he was not disobedient unto the heavenly vision." Obedience to the heavenly vision—that was the secret of it all. He was an elderly man, nearing the end of his life, when he made this confession of faith firmly but humbly in the presence of King Agrippa. Many years had elapsed since that memorable day—memorable, as you may see, by the simple fact that throughout the world it is to-day being commemorated—when on the road to Damascus he had been temporarily blinded by the merciful vision, and, "trembling and astonished," had cried, "Lord, what wilt Thou have me to do?" Years they had been of storm and stress, of supreme effort and endurance, of dogged opposition overcome by living faith. In the course of them he had had experiences more numerous and more varied than are included in the lifetime of half a dozen ordinary men. You are familiar with the curiously precise account which he gives of them in the Second Epistle to the Corinthians. He had had many strange adventures; he had faced many dangers; he had been the object of such love, and also of such hate, as have rarely been the lot of any one man; he had founded Christian Churches which were to have a mighty influence in the history of the world; he had written to these Churches epistles destined to be translated into every known human language, including scores of languages which had not so much as come into existence at the date that he wrote; epistles destined also to mould the thoughts and the conduct of men for ages throughout the civilised world. And yet, when he looked back upon a life so varied and so eventful, its significance seemed to him to be all summed up in one single

moment, in that wonderful vision when there shone on him a light brighter than the sun, while to his ears there came sounds, unintelligible indeed to all those who stood around, while to him they were as the words of a Master whom in his blindness he had thought to withstand, but who now told him that he had been chosen to make the Church Catholic, to preach the gospel to the Gentiles, "to open their eyes and to turn them from darkness to light, and from the power of Satan unto God, that they might receive forgiveness of sins and inheritance among them who are sanctified by faith." Strenuous and earnest indeed his life had been already, but he had been sailing on the wrong tack. Now, however, a guiding star shone forth for him over "the waves of this troublesome world"; it was a vision of the Cross of Christ and of the whole world reconciled to God by that Cross, which now henceforward drew him onwards, in spite of all the storms that broke out against him. And so, if we wish to

express in one simple phrase the secret of this great man, whose courage and genius as well as his faith and love raise him so high above the level even of the greatest uninspired men, we cannot do better than recall the words spoken, as I said, humbly but firmly in the presence of an unbelieving king: "I was not disobedient unto the heavenly vision."

That is the explanation of it all.

Saul of Tarsus—unlike that other Saul the king, who is an example of failure in a high vocation—Saul of Tarsus is thus the supreme example of what a man can become, who with God's help strenuously and unselfishly follows out an ideal given him by God as an inspiring vision in his youth or early manhood, or perhaps even if not vouch-



safed to him until middle life or his declining years. Ideals are indeed more commonly granted in youth, but in maturer years they are more pondered over and are better understood; nor is their realisation even then impossible, if only with God's help we go to work the right way. And their power to mould our lives is greater than most of us imagine; so that it should be for us a subject for earnest aspiration and prayer that the ideals of our young men and women may be noble and unselfish and pure, and that they may strive towards them with patience and zeal, so that, when years have passed away, they too may look back without shame to the days of their youth, and say with simplicity and truth, "Thank God, we were not disobedient unto the heavenly vision."

*Eds.* - Of course we must not look for heavenly visions of a miraculous kind. Our unimportance in the history of the world would not warrant us in indulging in any such vain anticipations. But in due measure and in proportion with that which we are, those dreams of youth which inspire us to think and then to plan and to work, are God's way of arousing us to fill worthily that place in life towards which He is calling us; and we should in that sense accept and obey "the heavenly vision" that is granted to us. Such day-dreams are, I know, often enough disfigured and degraded by elements of mere selfish and earthly ambition; but it is the province of religion to purge our ideals, while the ideal itself would perhaps be too little attractive if at the first it revealed itself to us in that austere form which on closer acquaintance we find that it really possesses. It ~~was indeed~~ pointed out by the great Brighton preacher, Frederick Robertson, that it is largely by ~~such~~ illusions that God in His mercy leads

us on; as we find it to have been the case in the story of His chosen people. And this same thought is also well illustrated in two verses (one of them autobiographical) written by the late Cardinal Newman about the year 1836—

“ Did we but see,  
 When life first opened, how our journey lay  
 Between its earliest and its closing day;  
 Or view ourselves as we one time shall be,  
 Who strive for the high prize—such sight would break  
 The youthful spirit, though bold for Jesus' sake.

But Thou, dear Lord,  
 Whilst I traced out bright scenes which were to come,  
 Isaac's pure blessings and a verdant home,  
 Didst spare me, and withhold Thy fearful word,  
 Wiling me, year by year, till I am found  
 A pilgrim pale, with Paul's sad girdle bound.”

The dreams of boyhood are mostly dreams of realised ambition; and such dreams need, it is true, purification by the motives of religion; yet they are not to be despised; for ambitions are often noble in themselves, and the youth who in a kind of vision sees himself as a man living and acting as he would wish to live and act, is really helped towards the realisation of his ideal by the thrill of mingled hope and triumph that affects his whole frame when he pictures to himself the moment when he will have reached that climax of his hopes, which it is wholly honourable in him to desire to reach. Without some such “heavenly vision”—for these things are from God, or are at any rate permitted by Him—many a man who has served God and his country well would have frittered away his energies in useless or in ignoble pursuits, and, unmanned by depression, would never have achieved anything at all.

This thought is well illustrated for us whenever

we visit this great and venerable church, which has been termed our national temple of reconciliation by death. It is that, but it is more than that. Here we lay to rest, with such external honours as are at our command, those who have been markedly "obedient to the heavenly vision," whose light has so shone before their countrymen that their greatness is even in their lifetime acknowledged by all. It may be a saintly king, whose relics still repose in honour behind the high altar, though more than eight centuries have elapsed since his death; or it may be a great statesman, laid to rest here less than five years ago, one who ever bore in mind a judgment greater than man's that would one day scrutinise his work; or it may be an inspired poet, skilful in the delineation of human character, or able to give devout expression to the doubt-resisting faith of to-day; or it may be a patient student of science, tracing the slow evolution of God's creation until it reaches its greatest physical perfection in man;—it matters not, all are welcomed here and are honoured here, because all truth is of God, and all of them have worked for truth in that direction in which they were attracted by ideals presented to them.

But not in every case is it possible actually to confer this honour; and of this we are reminded by the object for which your alms are solicited to-day. If there has been of recent times a man of our race granted a heavenly vision and obedient to it through life, surely that man was General Charles George Gordon, whose mutilated body lies buried some thousands of miles away from this place. And not the least noble part of his vision was that which taught him the excellence of training boys in habits of discipline, order, and reverence. That

work begun by him is now successfully carried on by the Gordon Boys' Home on a larger scale than was possible to him in his lifetime. It is in need of support; it eminently deserves support; and I ask for it your liberal contributions this morning. Few things are more necessary in this our day than reverence and discipline; and these form the main principles of the institution in question.

Nor should we forget to-day, as one who was "obedient to his heavenly vision," that unselfish and unambitious philanthropist, Mr. Quintin Hogg, whose work in London will long be remembered with gratitude by thousands both old and young. An Eton boy, and one proficient in certain games, he saw, when he came to live in London, the utter desolation of the lives of the poor boys that haunt its streets, through their having no innocent games at which to play. And so, with a devotion worthy of St. Francis, he associated with them as one of themselves, gained their love and confidence, and ultimately, by a judicious use of his wealth, was able to extend his good work over a much wider area, and to brighten the days and especially the evenings of a vast number of those who, without being really poor, have no margin to their income enabling them to pay for instructive recreation. Nor did he neglect the spiritual side of their lives; but the special merit of his work lies in his practical recognition of the fact that, for an existence to be human and not merely mechanical, to make it capable of "obedience to a heavenly vision" and not merely animal, grovelling to gratify its sensual appetites, recreations and amusements must be provided, such as train the eye, harden the muscle, and give the soul that sunshine which breaks forth in a hearty and innocent laugh. God grant to

this country that it may never cease to produce men who understand these things as he understood them.

Is a heavenly vision granted to us all, or must some of us, most of us, go to our graves without one? To all, save to such as deliberately mind only earthly things, I think we may say that a vision, an ideal, is granted, suitable to each person's age and condition and prospects. To some it comes early, to others it comes late; but "if the vision tarry, wait for it; for it will surely come, it will not tarry." But let us remember that it is a grace that is given to the humble. "Last of all, He was seen of me, as of one born out of due time," said St. Paul, not over-elated by the splendid privilege of his wonderful conversion; and, when received, it must be obeyed with patience, or else the gift may prove fruitless. It is patience that has her "perfect work." And lastly, the work of realising the ideal is one that must be wrought in the spirit of prayer. The disciple who was sent to counsel and comfort Saul in those days of his blindness and desolation, which followed immediately upon his call, was given this sign by which he might recognise a true convert, a man anxious with heart and soul to be "obedient unto the heavenly vision": "Behold, he prayeth."

## THE OLD TESTAMENT AND ITS CRITICS

### I

“Thy word is tried to the uttermost ; and Thy servant loveth it.”—Ps. cxix. 140.

No one can read the current literature of our day without becoming aware that, of recent years, in some quarters at any rate, a great change has been coming over men's minds as regards their views concerning the Bible, and especially the Old Testament. I do not now say whether that change is in a right or in a wrong direction ; I merely mention it as a fact, an undeniable fact, that new ideas are “in the air,” and that they affect, not merely the student, but even what is popularly called “the man in the street.” It is a matter of common knowledge ; and, that being so, it is only natural that Christian Churchmen at such a time should look for information and guidance to their clergy, whose duty it has been, during their time of preparation for the ministry, and whose duty it remains, during the whole period of their ministry, to study these things, and to endeavour to form a true and just judgment upon them. The Bible is our textbook ; we come to you with the Bible in our hands ; we should have but little to say to you without it, and you would not care to listen to us if we came without it ; so that when this question of the nature

and value of our text-book is raised, it is inevitable that you, or some of you specially interested, should ask, "What have you to say to this?" and when we are asked, it is, in the language of the Prayer-Book, "very meet, right, and our bounden duty," that we should say what we believe to be the truth in reply. And if it should be objected that such answers should be given privately, or at best to a select audience of specially interested hearers, and not in sermons in church at the ordinary times of public worship, I think the reply is that, if a clergyman believes that he can give a reassuring answer to the question, as I most sincerely believe he can, the greater publicity the better; for these objections are no longer raised in a corner; they meet us everywhere; and the reply should be equally free and above-board, lest doubts and suspicions should be aroused that no reply is forthcoming at all. Nor does it suffice to say simply, "You may trust me that there is an answer," and to say no more. The answer must be not less complete than the statement to which it forms a reply. At any rate, although in sermons it is impossible to deal with every detail, certain principles should be established, which indicate a solution of the whole problem. Not less than this may fairly be expected.

And if I may be allowed a word of personal explanation, why I have ventured to respond to an invitation to deal, in a short course of sermons, with a subject on which one is very liable to be misunderstood, and concerning which there exists an immense and a daily growing mass of literature, so that for mere lack of time it would be impossible to deal with it adequately, even if one had the ability, I will say this, that the date of my preparation at Oxford for examination in the School of Theology,

*i.e.* the years 1869, 1870, and 1871, coincided very nearly with the period when the free criticism of the Bible, then in this country in its infancy, was first coming to be regarded as a subject that should be studied by candidates for ordination, and was ceasing to be regarded as an abominable thing, which every good Christian should avoid and denounce.

And though I do not, of course, pretend to have read one tithe of the books dealing with the subject that have been published during the last thirty years, I have read a good many of them, and some of the most recent, and the subject is one that for me has never lost its interest. Moreover, I am able to sympathise with those who dread what seems to them the destructive character of modern criticism; for, about five years after taking my degree at Oxford, I came to the conclusion that its disintegrating power could only be met by opposing to it the authority of an infallible Church; while, seven years later, it seemed to me that even that authority itself must succumb before its solvent power. That is now some twenty years ago, and during that interval I have come to see more precisely what biblical criticism can do and what it cannot do; and while I accept as well established its general principles and its main conclusions, I am sure now that it is powerless against the true faith of a Christian—more truly, I might say that it is not even hostile to that faith; but that, while it relieves us of many difficulties and anxieties, and makes many things plain which without it remained obscure, it also throws a fresh light on the origins and the growth of the true religion, whether in its Jewish or its Christian dispensation, and shows us further the reasonableness of the faith that is in us. It is related of the late Mr. C. H. Spurgeon, that



when asked whether he would not do something to defend the Bible, he replied, "Defend the Bible! I should as soon think of defending a lion. It can defend itself, and does not need me." That is a striking way of stating what I believe to be substantially the truth. The Bible, rightly understood, is its own sufficient apologist; but then the Bible, rightly understood, is not, we must remember, our authority on history or on science; it is rather the record of the progressive revelation of the mind and purpose of God in creating and redeeming and sanctifying the world. It is only when we seek to use the Bible for purposes for which it was never intended that we find ourselves landed in difficulties from which there is really no escape save in retreat; and the criticism with which I have in these lectures to deal, while it does not by itself enable us to appreciate or apprehend the spiritual truth which the Bible contains (that we are only enabled to do by the grace of faith, which is a gift of God), it does help us to take such a view of the materials in which the revelation is contained, that we can far more easily distinguish the revelation itself from the vehicle which conveys it. This, however, is anticipating one of the conclusions towards which I hope to point; and in what I have to say this morning I do not propose to do more than introduce the subject, to explain my aims, and to conclude with a few words, asking for charity towards those from whom we may differ, and for confidence in the ultimate result.

All truth is of God, and can be used in His service; and if the new view of the Bible is the legitimate outcome of sound scholarship and of reverent research, we must not and we cannot arbitrarily set it aside because it may accord ill with our former concep-

tions of the truth in this matter. And it cannot be denied that the change involved is a considerable one. Dr. Charles Gore, until recently Canon of Westminster, and now Bishop of Worcester, who has been a patient and cautious student of this question during the period of thirty years of which I have spoken, is reported to have said that the change involved is as great as that which came when, in the seventeenth century, through the discoveries of Galileo and of Copernicus, men found themselves compelled to abandon the geocentric system of astronomy and to accept the heliocentric ; that is to say, when it was perceived and proved by competent observers that the earth is not as such the centre of the universe, but that (at any rate relatively to our own planetary system) the sun is.

The illustration is a very good one, because the cases are parallel in more points than one. One objection to the new astronomy was, that it was not in accordance with the Bible, and that men's faith would thereby be shaken. Of course every line in the Bible was written by men who accepted, and never doubted the truth of, the old astronomy ; and wherever the sun or the moon or the stars are mentioned in it, the implication is geocentric and not heliocentric. This is true even of our Lord's own words ; but it does not affect a revelation which has to do with things spiritual and not with things scientific.

Moreover, the new astronomy was alarming. For the earth to be moving through space with unimaginable speed, and rotating on its own axis meanwhile, seemed as dangerous as it was incredible. How could men peacefully retire to rest at night if they had to believe in the rapid movement of what had

hitherto been supposed to be absolutely unmoved? Experience has shown that these alarms were baseless; and of course the new astronomy did not inaugurate these movements, but only called attention to the fact that they had existed all along, though unperceived. The world has not been a less safe or a less agreeable abode for humanity since the facts concerning its relation to the sun have become better known.

So also will it be, I am confident, with the acceptance—very gradual as that acceptance must be—of the new criticism, at any rate so far as concerns the Old Testament, with which alone we shall be dealing in this course of addresses. Our faith in the incarnation of the Son of God, in His advent, which this season of the year commemorates, will remain wholly undisturbed; it will really be further enlightened. The Old Testament is sometimes spoken of, figuratively, as the pedestal on which the Incarnate Son of God stands. Perhaps it is better described as the background of the picture, or as the "hinterland" of that sacred shore where we see the gracious Figure beckoning to us to come. In any case, the Figure remains intact, though the materials that form the pedestal prove not to be altogether such as had been supposed; or the background of the picture proves to be less precise in its details than, without a closer examination, it had seemed. The sacred Figure may even gain in brilliancy and distinctness when the background is seen to be more obscure.

But anyhow, leaving the language of metaphor, it is certain that the men who have recently studied the Bible in the new light, either at first or at second hand, are as enthusiastic Christians as any that have lived in any earlier age. It is in no spirit

of hostility that they have laboriously examined every phrase, every word, every letter of the Old Testament, in order to ascertain its date and its significance; and we do well to accept their work without misgiving. It is true that they are not all members of our own Church of England who have taken part in this work, but we have—all of us, I should hope—long ago left behind the superstition that only members of one's own communion can be expected to arrive at right conclusions in their biblical studies. At the same time, we certainly do right to distrust the conclusions of men whose temper is evidently hostile to the faith; we do well to distrust the conclusions of men whose scholarship may have done good service in the past, but who, in later years, seem to be embarking on a campaign of clever but altogether wild textual criticism, in which conjecture runs riot, and anything may be changed into anything else; a criticism wholly different from that with which I propose to deal, wherein we shall limit ourselves to the things that are most surely established, and are unlikely now to be set aside.

A recent writer (Mr. W. C. Allen, a young clergyman of great distinction and promise) thus states the three different views that men and women take of the subject that we have now in hand:—

“The two words, ‘Biblical Criticism,’ suggest to different classes of people very different trains of ideas. To some, chiefly to those whose knowledge of critics and criticism is drawn only from apologetic writings, they carry with them a dark and sinister meaning. To such persons biblical critics seem to be the relentless foes of Christianity, who spend their time in fruitless efforts to undermine the foundations of the Christian faith. Their

endeavours are indeed futile, because the ecclesiastical traditions against which they direct their attacks are an integral part of the Christian revelation, and therefore cannot be permanently shaken. But in the meantime, faith is distressed, devotion harassed, and the members of Christ's Church needlessly frightened.

"To others, again (the unbelieving class), the words Biblical Criticism suggest freedom and liberty: freedom from outworn creeds, liberty from antiquated and exploded beliefs. To these, biblical critics are the pioneers of scientific progress, who are doing much to free the mind of man from the shackles of an obstinate dogmatism. Their work is indeed not yet complete, because erroneous beliefs die hard, and views about the Bible which have ceased to be scientifically tenable still darken the atmosphere of men's lives. But in the meantime the foundations of the temple of liberty have been laid; and though the building is incomplete, men are everywhere pressing into it.

"But to yet a third class [to which the writer, Mr. Allen himself, belongs], literary criticism of the Bible presents itself neither as the foe of Christianity nor as its conqueror, but rather as its ally. It comes to them, not in the guise of a dreaded enemy, much less of a victorious enemy, but rather as a long-desired and gladly-welcomed friend. To such, belief in the inspiration of the Bible, so far from being shaken by a century of criticism, has been greatly strengthened by it. They believe in the Bible, not in spite of criticism, but because of it; not under protest against it, but by reason of it; not although criticism has shown that certain views of inspiration are untenable, but just because this has been the case."

I think this writer rather overstates the case in this last paragraph. We believe in the inspiration of the Bible, not because of criticism, but because history, reason, and our own interior experience have taught us to believe in the Incarnation of the Son of God; and that faith illuminates the pages both of the Old and of the New Testament, and shows us that, where they are historical, they are more than mere history, and that, even where the Old Testament is not historical, but allegorical, and poetical, and ideal, it is what I may call the Divine presentiment of the coming Incarnation that gives to its words their spiritual force.

But with this correction, we may, I think, accept Mr. Allen's account of his third class as a fair statement of the view which will be followed in the present course of lectures.

One thing, however, I should like to add before I conclude this morning, and to add with urgency and earnestness. We who attend this Church (or any other Church, for that matter) are believers. We belong, therefore, not to the second class specified, but either to the first or the third. All of us, perhaps, by early education have at one time belonged to the first; most of us belong to it still; many will never cease to belong to it.

Others have already passed into the third class (*i.e.* of those who welcome and accept the new criticism, but remain, possibly even thereby become, fervent believers), or are passing over to it, with the feeling that they cannot any longer remain in the first class of traditionally orthodox believers, but must pass into the second (or become unbelievers), if they do not enter the third.

What, then, must be the present relation between those of us who are in the first and third classes

respectively? It must be, it should be, one of mutual respect and toleration, based on faith and hope and charity. Those who accept the newer views concerning the Bible and its inspiration must on no account despise those who hold to the older views, and could not be happy without them. They are not bound to abandon them. They have been held, those older views, for many generations, and have been supported with much zeal and learning; and though it seems likely that a new spiritual era is opening before us, and that God, Who "fulfils Himself in many ways," intends the twentieth century to be as marked a period in the history of religion as the sixteenth century was with its Reformation, the traditional ideas have not yet lost their soul-sustaining power. But then, also, they who hold them must not be ready to suspect or to denounce the advocates of the new learning. Only with this understanding can I proceed with this course of lectures. We who believe, not only that God has spoken, but also that He speaks; we who believe that the Church of our Master, Christ, is, and always has been, a learner as well as a teacher—for His Spirit is continually guiding it into truth—we claim, and we shall not, I think, be denied the consideration to be treated with that charity which "beareth all things, believeth all things, hopeth all things."

## THE OLD TESTAMENT AND ITS CRITICS

### II

“Whatsoever things were written aforetime were written for our learning; that we through patience and comfort of the scriptures might have hope.”—ROM. xv. 4.

ON this, the second Sunday in Advent, which may be called “Bible Sunday,” we appropriately continue our consideration of the recent criticism of the Old Testament, our object being the better understanding of the Scriptures, in the light of the increase of knowledge which, by patient study, men are gaining here, as in all other departments of learning. Last Sunday morning you will remember that I endeavoured to introduce the subject as one which we may approach not only without alarm or misgiving, but even with confidence and hope. That the new point of view makes a very considerable difference, I could not deny; but when we have accepted it, we stand, I think, on firmer ground thenceforth. There are some other preliminary considerations which it is necessary to deal with before we approach the main subject itself, and I must ask you to be patient if you think that our progress is slow.

It may be asked by some whether we have any right to assume that there is anything fresh to be learnt about the Bible; whether we ought not to be content to accept it as we have received it from



earlier generations ; whether it is not even rash and presumptuous and wrong to imagine that we can obtain any new light, such as our fathers had not ; whether we should not be satisfied with what satisfied them, and so to leave the matter alone ?

Now an objection of this kind is not merely plausible and conservative, it is suggested by piety and by reverence for God's holy Word, which it seeks to protect from a free handling that may even prove to be sacrilegious. So it hardly suffices, I think, to set it aside with the statement, which is none the less perfectly true, that we cannot prevent this free handling, even if we wished to do so ; that the manuscripts, such as they are, of our Bible are accessible to all the learned world, and will be, indeed have been, examined and criticised by competent scholars, some of whom are neither Churchmen nor Christians, and who are, of course, free to publish their conclusions to the world. It may be urged that it is therefore a matter of prudence and common sense to take part ourselves in this examination, and to ascertain its value, so as not to be left behind in the matter, even when regarded as one of mere learning and erudition.

But that is by no means the whole of the reply that should be made ; and the fuller reply is perhaps best indicated by an illustration. If you had gone to Westminster Abbey, just four hundred years ago, to attend the principal service there on a Sunday morning, you would have found the building substantially the same as it is at present, but you would certainly have noticed some things in the service itself of which you might very likely have been disposed to ask the meaning.

For one thing—and of course I deal now only with the one thing that concerns us—you would have

noticed, standing between two lighted candles on a little table to the right of the altar, a handsomely bound book; and when, later in the service, the book was opened, you might have seen that it was an exquisitely written manuscript, with the capital letters at the commencement of each section beautifully illuminated in gold and colours. Nor would you have failed to notice the extraordinary reverence—at any rate external reverence—with which this book was treated.

Not long after the beginning of the service, a deacon, splendidly vested, would take this book from off this little table, and then kneel to ask the blessing in his use of it of the priest taking the chief part in the service. Then, in procession with others bearing lights and incense, he would carry the book to the northern side of the sanctuary, open it and cense it, chant from it in Latin a page or so, with quaint and solemn cadence; and, this done, the book would be carried to the Abbot of Westminster, for him to kiss the sacred page just used; and finally, the book would be placed on the little table, and between the lighted candles, as before.

I think you might very naturally have asked what that book was; and your next neighbour, with a look of surprise at your question, would have answered, "It is the Gospel." "And what is the Gospel?" "Oh, well, it is a part of the New Testament sung before the Creed at High Mass." Fuller information than that you would hardly have obtained; for, as the recitation was in Latin, your friend could hardly have had more than a vague impression as to what that particular Gospel was about, especially as the conventional and traditional pronunciation of the Church Latin, when sung, made it more difficult to follow than Latin as ordin-

arily read. But of one thing your neighbour would have been certain, and that is that "the Gospel" was rightly and fully understood, and in practice obeyed, in those opening years of the sixteenth century; whereas that is just the point on which we should now most certainly differ from him.

Of the ritual observances to which I have referred there is no need to say anything in this connection. They have their advantages and their dangers. True spiritual religion may exist with them or without them; and, unfortunately, they may exist without true spiritual religion. It is largely a matter of expediency, and of the temper and taste of the times in which men live. But that is not the point at present. The point is, not merely that the men who chanted the Gospel in Latin four hundred years ago knew nothing of the Hebrew of the Old Testament, or of the Greek of the New Testament—that would not have mattered much, for the Latin that they used fairly represented the original, and in some texts was even more exact than the Greek manuscripts, discovered about that time, and printed with such enthusiasm by Erasmus and others. It was not, however, merely literary information, or a better knowledge of the history of the Bible, which the new learning of the sixteenth century brought to light; it was an altogether deeper and broader and truer appreciation of what the Gospel really was, that in the end was the outcome of the critical researches of the students who preceded and heralded the Reformation.

It is no exaggeration to say that in the sixteenth century, mainly through the newly aroused interest in the epistles of St. Paul, which had hardly attracted any attention since the days of St. Augustine, a new revelation was made to our Western world of the

person and work of Jesus Christ our Lord, a new revelation, which in later years was largely recognised and assimilated by the unreformed Church as well, so that it is now a part of the inheritance of all who "name the name of Christ."

Now, I do not say that a similar new revelation is in store for the twentieth century. That is hardly likely; anyhow, not on the same scale. But we may have something to learn, as well as a good deal to unlearn. For we have accumulated, in the course of centuries, a vast burden of traditional interpretation, together with an unauthorised and traditional notion of the scope of inspiration, which hamper us, altogether gratuitously, when we seek to present our religion in an attractive form—in that which is, I believe, its true form—to the great mass of intelligent men and women who at present stand aloof from it. You treasure your Bibles; you have them handsomely bound in "full morocco" or "calf antique," perhaps with red and gold edges. You love—and rightly love—the majestic English of the Authorised Version; indeed, you love it so much that you are disposed to resent as an impiety the slight corrections that are supplied to you in the Revised Version; and does not that little fact suggest to you that perhaps you are putting too high a value on the traditional form, and that in a similar spirit you may be regarding as actual history what is really only an idealisation of the past; that you may be taking literally what was written as allegory or as poetry, and was meant to be taken as such? These are some of the questions which a study of the new criticism will lead you to ask; and it is a question which we should all ask ourselves in sober seriousness, whether we have not been in danger of "making

the Word of God of none effect through our traditions."

There is a further preliminary point of some importance; and that is, our freedom, as members of the Church of England, to face these questions, concerning the origin of Holy Scripture and its interpretation, frankly and fairly, and to accept those conclusions which approve themselves to our intelligence as well as to our conscience. It is necessary to assert our freedom in this matter, because in a great community there is inevitably a minority of ill-informed, fussy, and narrow-minded people, who delight in writing to the newspapers to stir up strife, if they can, in regard to what they call the "dishonesty" of clergymen, who, they say, receive the pay of the Church while they deny its doctrines. It is, of course, a very effective charge to bring; and it is one that, at various times, has brought much odium on good men, who, if they were to blame at all, were only to blame as being a little in advance of their times.

Take, for example, the case of the present Archbishop of Canterbury, honoured now of all men in his eighty-second year, which seems likely to prove also the last year of his life. He is honoured now, but it was not always so. In the year 1860, when he was headmaster of Rugby School, a volume of *Essays and Reviews* was published, in which the first essay, entitled "The Education of the World," was by him. Its aim was to show that God's revelation of Himself to man was a gradual and progressive one. Every one holds this now; but forty years ago the view was a new one. Men's ideas of the Bible were such that they seemed almost to believe that the Old Testament had been revealed as a material whole, in a complete and cast-iron

form ; and that the same was true, at a later date, of the New Testament. No other stages were admitted ; while Dr. Temple's article implied that it was but slowly, and from small beginnings, that the truth about God had dawned upon the world. People were alarmed to an extent that is now almost incredible. Parents withdrew their sons from the school ; and it was debated whether the governing body should not dismiss so unorthodox a headmaster.

The matter was revived when, nine years later, Dr. Temple was appointed Bishop of Exeter ; and it was amidst a scene of violence and of excited protest in Bow Church, Cheapside, that his appointment was legally confirmed. And even when he was appointed Archbishop of Canterbury, twenty-seven years later still, there were some who protested, because in his Bampton Lectures he had shown that he accepted the principle or doctrine of evolution.

This subject might easily be pursued at length ; but it must suffice now to indicate that, human language being such as it is, if the literal and grammatical force of every sentence in every ancient formulary were insisted upon to the fullest possible extent as the test of orthodoxy or of honesty, then no man could remain a clergyman of the Church of England, nor indeed of any Church that has its roots in the past.

Thus, for example, strictly interpreted, a clause in the Apostle's Creed would mean that the same Jesus Christ who was crucified, and died, and was laid in the tomb, went down, body and soul, into hell. It is not there stated that it is of His soul only that this descent is asserted.

Strictly interpreted, the Athanasian Creed would mean that every Unitarian and every member of the Churches of the East is eternally lost. And

in the 13th Article we have the implication that the virtuous acts of the heathen had "the nature of sins." Now no one, either clergyman or layman, believes these things. To insist on them as binding on the conscience would be, we all feel, intolerable. We all feel it, I say; though I know some do not like to vindicate this claim for freedom, lest, in allowing some liberty, too much should thereupon be asked for or taken. But in these cases, at any rate, all have to admit that the documents have to be interpreted and explained in the light of history and of common sense. We must take note of the circumstances under which such assertions seem to have been made; and in that way freedom from their stringency, the stringency of the letter, is obtained. And in a similar spirit must be treated whatever there may seem to be in the formularies of the Church of England inconsistent with that freedom in the treatment of Holy Scripture, which she herself vindicated by her own action in the sixteenth century. Much less relaxation, however, is in this matter demanded than is commonly supposed. That Holy Scripture, as the 6th Article states, "containeth all things necessary to salvation," no one disputes; what the newer view of the Bible shows, more clearly than had been seen heretofore, is that it also contains many things that are not in that sense necessary; though this, again, no one denies. There is, indeed, one sentence in the service for the "Ordering of Deacons"—"Do you unfeignedly believe all the canonical Scriptures of the Old and New Testament?"—which might be taken to imply a belief in the literal and historical accuracy of every sentence contained therein. But it has long ago been explained, and the explanation has been generally

accepted, that this belief has reference to the teaching of the Bible as a whole, to the spirit and not to the letter, and that a man who sees in the Bible God's record of Himself, revealing Himself to men who were indeed but slow to understand His revelation, in the Old Testament, as One, and as Righteous and as promising a Redeemer; and in the New Testament, more fully, as One in Three, a Father, an Incarnate Saviour, and a Sanctifier; such a man can without conscientious scruple reply to the question asked, "I do believe them." Nor can it, I think, be maintained that a clergyman is bound to have a more extensive faith than a layman. A clergyman's faith should indeed be fervent and be well instructed; but he cannot be called upon to believe anything beyond what is true; and a layman should not be content with believing anything short of it.

It is impossible for me to include this morning what I had proposed to say on the precedent for modern criticism which the Church of England herself provided in the sixteenth century, by her treatment of the then accepted tradition as to the position occupied by the old Latin Bible, called the Vulgate. That must now stand over until next Sunday. I will conclude with a few words chiefly taken from Dr. Boyd-Carpenter's recent *Introduction to the Study of the Scriptures*, as he there explains very clearly what I also have in view in this course of addresses.

They are meant for hearers who are genuinely interested in the Bible, but who may be also troubled and perplexed. They are not meant for people who are contemptuous about the Bible, and have rapidly concluded that, because it contains much that is of a legendary character, it is therefore



wanting in spiritual force, and may be henceforth neglected without loss or regret. Nor are they meant for people who think that research and criticism, though legitimate elsewhere, are profane and sacrilegious when they approach the Bible. I speak to people who believe and are sure that the Bible contains a message from God to them, but who are anxious to be reassured that the strength and clearness of this message will not be impaired when they come to realise (what they will probably be long in realising) that inspiration does not, and was never intended to, guarantee historical accuracy, but only the Godward aspirations of those to whom He spoke within, and who, in recording their spiritual experiences, set down also their beliefs about the world and their own national history, just as they had received them in the ordinary process of their education, which carried no infallibility with it. That which is true of all human history, namely, its idealisation of the distant past, concerning which no real records exist, finds its counterpart in the Bible. But the distinguishing mark of what we call "Holy Scripture" is this, that the presence, providence, and self-revealings of God are continuously recognised; and that in the Old Testament, to which we are confining our attention, we have the history of a specially inspired race, whose interpretation of the world and of their own place in it only becomes intelligible in the light of the Incarnation. It is said, and said truly, that the new criticism has vastly increased our power of appreciating the value of the messages delivered by the Jewish prophets. That is so, because "to Him"—to our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, the Word made flesh and dwelling among us, and spiritually present with us still—"to Him give all the prophets witness."

## THE OLD TESTAMENT AND ITS CRITICS

### III

“Every scripture inspired of God is also profitable for teaching, for reproof, for correction, for instruction which is in righteousness.”—2 TIM. iii. 16.

I QUOTE these words from the Revised rather than from the Authorised Version, because the slight variation in the translation seems to bring out more clearly the point that the writer had in view. The reference is, of course, exclusively to the Scriptures of the Old Testament, in which Timothy had been instructed from his infancy; and their inspiration is here rather assumed than affirmed; the assertion being that, as such, they are “profitable for teaching,” and so forth. The words read almost as if they were an answer to a question whether all the Old Testament writings can be of service in this way. It is quite possible that Timothy may have had a doubt on this subject, not only as a Christian but also as a Jew, and may have asked for guidance. The canon, or authentic list of the books of the Old Testament, was barely yet settled, and the practice of re-editing the older literature, with additions and corrections, though it had ceased to be done with official sanction for some four hundred and fifty years, was still followed by individuals among the learned Jews nearly up to the time of our Lord’s birth. There

has recently been published an English translation of the book known as *Jubilees*; or, *The Little Genesis*, which was written in Hebrew, probably by a Pharisee and about the year 60 B.C., in the form of a revelation to Moses. It is a kind of abridgment of the Book of Genesis and of a portion of Exodus, the author omitting such incidents as, from his point of view (that of the Pharisees), were not edifying; while his main object was to glorify the Mosaic law by showing that it had really existed from the creation of the world, and was observed by the angels before it was revealed on earth; and he gives a new chronological setting to the history of the world from the creation until the entry of the Israelites into the promised land, making it to consist of fifty jubilee periods of forty-nine years each, whence the book bears the name of *Jubilees*.

The fact that such a book as this could be written in the last century B.C., and the freedom with which the author used his materials, in order to make the events square with his theory, should be borne in mind when we come to consider the way in which the Old Testament has grown into its present form, if we may trust the conclusions of the critics with whom we are now dealing. And possibly, in the apostle's words about "every scripture inspired by God," there may be some reference to this and to the numerous other works in circulation about this time, some seventy in all, which, though they did not obtain admission to the Jewish canon of Scripture, were not without a certain fitness to claim such admission, save for the facts that they were recent in origin, and, in most cases, were written in Greek and not in Hebrew.

And now a word must be said as to that precedent

for being guided by the best learning of the day which our Church of England set in the sixteenth century.

At the conclusion of my first lecture on this subject, I said that we believe the Church of our Master, Jesus Christ, to be a learner as well as a teacher; but in works on theology we are told so much about the *Ecclesia docens*, and so little about the *Ecclesia discens*, that the idea may have seemed to some of you a novelty, and rather a precarious one. Yet it is really a simple truth and an old one, for it is based on our Lord's own promise that the Holy Spirit should guide the Church into all truth; and it is perfectly certain that, in the course of the centuries, Christian doctrine, while remaining essentially "the faith once for all delivered to the saints," has undergone both development and clarification, and also that this is a process that will go on until the end of time. Even the Roman Church, which alone professes to be infallible and unchanging, is really subject to change, at any rate in so far as the appreciation and interpretation of doctrine are concerned, as two of her most distinguished sons, Cardinal Wiseman and Cardinal Newman, have admitted; and though in the sixteenth century the Roman Church thought to silence the biblical criticism of that day by condemning it at the Council of Trent, and by maintaining the mediæval tradition as to the authenticity of the Vulgate or the Latin version of the Bible, she is wiser now, as can be seen by the fact that the Pope himself has recently issued a commission to inquire into and report on the present condition of biblical studies. And it is really for Roman Catholics a matter of great concern; for, though the Roman Church may seem to you to have

wandered very far from the letter of the Bible as well as from its spirit, she does, nevertheless, claim that her doctrines are all drawn from the Bible, as well as from reason and tradition; and in that sense she does regard the Bible as her text-book, just as we do.

On the other hand, the Church of England in the sixteenth century accepted the biblical criticism of that day, and acted on the conclusions that were drawn from it to an extent that at the time must have seemed revolutionary. Certain parts of the Old Testament, that for centuries had been reckoned canonical, were relegated to a somewhat dubious position, in what we now call the Apocrypha, because it was ascertained that they had no Hebrew but only a Greek original. No doubt, so far as certain details are concerned, the action of our reformers in this matter is open to question. For example, the book which we call Ecclesiasticus had almost certainly a Hebrew original, and so, on their own showing, that book might well have been left in the canon; while, when they spoke so confidently of regarding as canonical books concerning which there "was never any doubt in the Church," they were ignorant that in the Jewish Church there were, for long, grave doubts concerning Ecclesiastes, the Song of Solomon, and the Book of Esther, while the Christian Church had similar doubts concerning certain books of the New Testament, as, for example, the second epistle attributed to St. Peter.

But these details only serve to show that in matters of this kind, although the main conclusions may be correct and the general principles sound, there is always more to be learned, and that for corrections in the light of fuller knowledge we must

always be prepared. And this consideration applies to the new criticism, with which we are now concerned, as fully as to that of earlier days. The point that I have just now been seeking to establish is merely this, that it is rather a matter of consistently doing our duty than a matter for reproach, when we of the Church of England give an approving though also a discriminating welcome to the new light which reverent and competent scholars claim to have found.

Now the "Higher Criticism" is so termed in distinction from the older or "textual criticism," not on account of any vanity in those who have inaugurated and pursued the study, but simply because, as a matter of fact, it involves the use of a higher and more cultivated intelligence. It is also called by others "literary criticism," because it is an analysis of the Bible as literature; and by others again "historical criticism," because its aim is to give a consistently historical account of the age of the documents with which it deals. But as this latter term, "historical criticism," is now being claimed by a new school of archæologists, who aim at reconstructing the history so far as is possible from the evidence of undoubtedly contemporary records, it is better to keep to the terms "higher" or "literary" criticism, to avoid confusion.

The older or textual criticism had a comparatively simple task to perform. To a large extent its work was merely mechanical. The existing manuscripts of the Hebrew Bible were carefully examined and compared; and in that way it was hoped to secure a correct text, the authority of the most ancient manuscripts, if unanimous, being decisive. And as the manuscripts differ very little from one another, the difficulty is not great. But

then, they are none of them more than about a thousand years old, while the originals that they represent were all written a thousand years earlier; so that this textual criticism, however accurate, does not really carry us very far. Nor was it possible to do anything more while Hebrew remained a practically dead language, familiar indeed to Jewish rabbis, but read by them conventionally and without any literary insight; while non-Jewish scholars treated it similarly, as a tongue which somehow had sprung into existence in its biblical form, and knew little or nothing of any process of development to which it had been subject, such as we find in the case of other languages. Thus, in the case of our own language, we are all of us familiar with this idea of growth. We know that King Alfred did not speak English as we do; indeed, each of the ten centuries since his death is marked by a gradual process of development, so that a competent scholar could date, with very fair accuracy, any newly discovered document or inscription, from the evidence of the language itself, even if there should be no other evidence to assist him. And this is really what the new criticism has done for the Bible. It has shown us that the Bible—or more precisely for our present purposes, the Old Testament—is a compilation, in which documents of very various dates, and of very varying character, have been welded together by editors who lived after the return from the Exile in Babylon, and who themselves, in their process of editing, made considerable additions to the documents with which they dealt; not with any idea of deceiving or of forging, but seeking, in a reverent spirit, to make fuller and clearer and more consistent the records and the devotional literature that had come down to them.

By way of illustration as regards this latter work, you may take the poems of Tennyson entitled the *Idylls of the King*. King Arthur was a real historical person, but of contemporary records, or even of monuments contemporary with his life, there exists practically nothing. There existed, however, a mass of traditions concerning his life, and these were set down by Sir Thomas Malory in the fourteenth century, in the quaint English of his day, Arthur's failings as well as his heroism being frankly recorded. The same legends were dealt with by Tennyson five hundred years later, but they were idealised, and in his hands, in that noble series of poems to which I have referred, the king becomes the perfect Christian hero.

Now, if you can imagine English many years hence to have become a dead language, and these distinct accounts of King Arthur to have been discovered and put together so as to make a consecutive story, and then to have been uniformly translated into some other language, you will see how in this other language the difference of date and authorship might long remain concealed, until, indeed, the original English was studied with knowledge of the growth of the language; and then the composite character of the narrative would become clear.

Now it has long been known to all students of the Bible that in the Book of Genesis are contained documents originally from different hands. There are, for example, two distinct accounts of the creation, in the first of which the Creator is called "God," while in the second, which begins at the fourth verse of the second chapter, He is called "The Lord God." So also there are two accounts of the Flood, now amalgamated into one, but distinguishable, even in the English version, because in the one



case the animals preserved in the ark are said to have been pairs, while in the other case they are said to have been sevens. These are small points, but, being familiar, they served to prepare men's minds for the information which the new criticism brings: that this diversity of authorship runs all through the Pentateuch and the Book of Joshua as well; that only a few fragments of these books, such as the Song of Deborah, can have existed in writing before the period of the kings; and that the bulk of the Hexateuch, as it is now called, including the detailed Levitical law and the account of the creation which stands first in our Bibles, must have been written either during the exile in Babylon or after the return to Jerusalem.

It is certainly startling to learn that the first chapter of the Book of Genesis is, so far as concerns the date of its composition, probably later than the Book of the prophet Malachi; but that is one of the conclusions that follow, if we accept the principle that the language of documents must settle the date at which those documents were written.

It is not my intention, in the present course of addresses, to go any further than this into detail as to what the higher criticism indicates as to the age and authorship of the books of the Old Testament. This must suffice to show that, while it entirely negatives the idea that Moses himself wrote the Pentateuch, as we now have it, by direct inspiration from God, it does not negative the idea that the books are, in a broader sense, inspired; while it shows also that, anyhow, this inspiration must have extended to a much larger number of persons than used to be supposed, and that it lasted until a much later period of Jewish history. But what

has been said suffices, I think, to illustrate what I quoted from Bishop Gore in my first lecture, that the change to the new point of view is as great as was, in the seventeenth century, the change to the new astronomy.

The time that remains to me now and on Sunday next I must occupy in an attempt to reassure you that the acceptance of this modern view need in no way disturb your faith as Christians; while, if you feel yourselves able to accept it, you will find that it clarifies your belief, and renders it less burdensome, freeing you from any sense of obligation to accept as revealed facts many things that are really only the venerable legends of a devout and imaginative race. Thus, in regard to the miracles of the Bible, it has always been possible to distinguish into two or more classes narratives that make mention of the miraculous. There are indeed in all history, as well as in the Bible, miracles recorded in contemporary documents which indicate the presence of exceptional spiritual power, the existence of which it is impossible to deny, although a man may never himself have had any experience of it. Miracles such as these—our Lord's miracles of healing are good examples—are always wrought for some moral or spiritual end; and we do ourselves no violence in accepting them as actual occurrences. But there is another class, where we find things narrated which are fantastic, antecedently incredible, in themselves without moral significance, more attributable to what we call poetic licence than to sober observation. Now, when an earlier generation criticised these things in the Bible (you may take the Flood, the crossing of the Red Sea, or the miracles in Daniel, as examples), our fathers resented the criticism, partly because they took inspiration

to mean a mechanical guarantee of historical accuracy, and partly because the inference of the critics seemed to be, that with God *not* all things are possible. But the new criticism, setting to work as a literary art, and so without any idea of calling in question miracles as such, has shown incidentally that wherever miracles of this second class are narrated in the Bible, it is invariably the case that the narratives were written centuries after the alleged occurrences ; and so the natural inference is that the accounts, not being based on observation, were, and were meant to be, ideal and not literally historical. They were the statement, often obviously poetical, and in an expanded and elaborate form, of national traditions, which have indeed a spiritual significance, when treated freely in this way, but become hard sayings and nothing else when we are called upon to take them literally. St. Paul used this freedom when, speaking of Abraham and his two wives and his two sons, he said, "which things are an allegory" ; and again, when he said the Israelites were "baptized unto Moses in the Red Sea, and all drank of that spiritual Rock which followed them, and that Rock was Christ." And, to recur to my former illustration, we do not suppose that Tennyson called us to believe in the actual miraculous gift and resumption of the sacred sword "Excalibur," though he told us the story so exquisitely and with such full and realistic details ; nor do we take Milton literally when he says of the expulsion of Lucifer from heaven, "Nine days he fell." We should regard as absurd any attempt so to take his words.

To this morning's sadly incomplete address there should by rights have been added some words on that broader view of the inspiration of Scripture which is associated with these newer views as to

its age and authorship. I can only say now that it is fully consistent with the verse from the Second Epistle to Timothy which I took for my text. The apostle does not say that every God-inspired scripture is an infallible authority on matters of fact, such as constitute our ordinary knowledge of nature or of history; but he says that such scriptures are "also profitable for teaching, for reproof, for correction, for instruction which is in righteousness." Plainly this has all to do with what is moral and spiritual, with the things that we have to believe and to do "for our souls' health." And, similarly, one effect of the higher criticism is to vindicate the simplicity of our religion; to dissociate it from human traditions, that have "crept in unawares," and have never possessed any real authority; to make the teaching of our Lord and Master paramount over the things that were "said by them of old time"; and generally, it enables us to thank God for this access of new light, and to "stand fast in the liberty wherewith Christ hath made us free."

## THE OLD TESTAMENT AND ITS CRITICS

### IV

“Ye search the scriptures, because ye think that in them ye have eternal life; and these are they which bear witness of Me; and ye will not come to Me, that ye may have life.”—  
JOHN v. 39, 40.

TO-DAY again I take my text from the Revised instead of from the Authorised Version.

It was but natural that the earlier translators of the Bible, in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, should use the imperative and not the indicative mood in connection with this word “search.” A new light had dawned upon them through their own search of the Scriptures, and they wished others in the same way to search and to find the same illumination. The tone of the voice, and the form of the sentence, would have shown, at the time of its utterance, whether the word was used as an exhortation or as a statement of a fact. The tone of the voice we cannot now recover, but the form of the sentence, “because ye think that in them ye have eternal life,” seems fully to justify the Revisers in using the indicative: “Ye search the scriptures”; for that gives also the proper force, by way of contrast, to the final clause: “Ye will not come unto Me that ye may have life.” Certainly the imperative may be used, and the meaning of the whole adequately brought out, if

we slightly alter the order of the clauses, and express definitely the exhortation implied in the last one: "Search the scriptures: for these are they which bear witness of Me: and then come to Me, to whom they bear witness, that ye may have life; but do not think that you will have that eternal life by a mere scrutiny of the letter."

The devout Jews did search the Scriptures with immense diligence; but, as St. Paul says, "a veil was over their hearts," and so they did not perceive the witness of what they read to Him who stood amongst them, unknown. And so His pleading was, "Come from the scriptures to Me, so that you may find the eternal life that you seek." Thus understood as a whole, the middle clause, "these are they—these Old Testament scriptures are they—that bear witness of Me," becomes an illuminating principle for our guidance in the matter which we have now in hand.

Without the coming of the Son of Man, without the Incarnation of the Son of God, the Old Testament, whether viewed in the old light or the new, becomes, in spite of all its lofty spiritual teaching, a record of disappointed hopes, a monument of misplaced confidence, a rope of sand, an unintelligible maze without a plan; and no eternal life is to be found in searching it, unless we come to Him to whom it witnesses.

It has been well said (and this is applicable to the New Testament as well as to the Old) that "our religion is not primarily one of historical reminiscence, though the perversity of the human heart is prone thus to misconceive it. If the exclusive charter of our faith lay in a distant past, and salvation consisted in believing that certain events happened centuries ago, then we could not well

postpone for a moment strict inquiry as to the exact state of the evidence for those historic facts upon which all belief must rest. The evidence, under these circumstances, would necessarily be for the most part external, and of a purely formal character; the whole issue would depend, in the last analysis, upon a minute and thoroughgoing literary criticism. And this criticism, if confirmatory, would be the very foundation-stone for the defence of our creed. But our religion is primarily a life. To be 'saved' is not to believe that something happened long ago, but to know God and Jesus Christ whom He has sent. It is to have come to Him, that we may have life; and it is to live this life of perfect love in fellowship with Him. Our religion, therefore, invites us to use tests other than those which lie within the province of a strictly scientific or literary criticism. The message that Jesus Christ came to bring may thus be put to the proof of practical experience, before we enter upon the question of the precise details of the actual delivery of the message and of the form in which it is conveyed."<sup>1</sup>

But this dissociation of ourselves from history must not, of course, be carried too far; and though what I want now briefly to deal with belongs rather to the criticism of the New Testament than to that of the Old Testament (which is my special subject in this course), the two are so inextricably linked together herein, around the Person of our Lord Jesus Christ, and the matter is itself one of such primary importance, that I should render nugatory all that I have been saying if I did not endeavour to make this point clear.

You are perhaps aware that in Germany, in

<sup>1</sup> Dr. Robbins, *A Christian Apologetic*, p. 116.

Protestant Germany, there is at the present time a Christian reaction, a great return, more especially among men of learning and culture, to the feet of Jesus, to learn from Him, and to adore. This reaction is chiefly connected with the names of Ritschl, who died in 1889, and of his disciple Harnack, who is perhaps the most distinguished and the most influential religious teacher now living. Forty years ago things were very different. Then the criticisms of Strauss on the Gospels and of Baur on the authenticity of the Pauline Epistles had produced in Germany so marked an effect, that it was cynically said the Protestant clergy had left themselves nothing to preach about, save the importance of taking regular exercise.

It was amidst this general decay of faith that Ritschl was enabled—perhaps I might even say inspired—to perceive the distinction between the doubtful authenticity of certain traditional beliefs as to the precise form in which Christianity has come down to us, and the essentially historic certainty that the Founder of our faith did live on this earth and did teach certain things, of which we have received a sufficiently full and accurate report. The scientific certainty of this modest foundation remains, and will always remain, in despite of anything that criticism can do. But then something more followed. Ritschl pointed out that, when brought into the presence of this undoubtedly historic Christ, whose “blessed feet for our advantage” trod the sands of Palestine some nineteen hundred years ago, we are conscious that we have found a spiritual Friend, whose words affect and move us in proportion as we study them more fully; that this friendship grows into reverential love; until, as in time we perceive the immense value that this teaching and



this life and this death have for us, we say, we cannot indeed restrain the utterances, "Never man spake like this man"; "Truly this was a Son of God"; "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God"; "My Lord and my God."

We search the Scriptures, though without any *a priori* theory as to their inspiration, or their being the vehicle of Divine revelation; we find that they bear witness to Christ; we come to Him that we may have life; and by this our act of faith in Him we obtain that life; and thenceforward, the glory of the Incarnation, the glory of God manifest in the flesh, illuminates these Scriptures, both of the Old and New Testaments, and we find in them much that we should never have perceived without the aid of that light; and it illuminates much else besides, so that we see how reasonable it is that the beginning and the end of that wonderful incarnate life on earth should have been, in some ways, different from what occurs in the lives of any ordinary men; and we are uplifted to what I may call a higher moral and spiritual plane, whence we can see, dimly perhaps, but still we can see, the purpose of God slowly manifested throughout the ages, and the justification of His ways with men.

There is, of course, much more than this in the Ritschlian account of the way back to God through Christ; of the way back, I mean, more especially for men of the modern world, who are abreast of the times, who know and accept the conclusions of science and criticism, and who have consequently been disposed to stand aloof from the old faith, as involving the acceptance of much that had long ago become to them incredible; but who, if they told the whole truth that is in their hearts, would

have to confess that they have found nothing that quite takes the place of the old faith, and that they would be glad once more to account themselves disciples of the unique Master and Teacher, if only they could see their way back to their old allegiance on a rational basis.

There is, I say, much more in "Ritschlianism," and a good deal of it is technical and tedious, and, so far as I can see, unnecessary; but the brief account that I have given is, in substance, the secret of the great Christian reaction to which I have referred; and if its influence is, so far, less felt in England than in Germany, that is largely because in this country we move more slowly, and also because the need for such a return is less. Our people have not yet wandered so far away.

Now the Scriptures of the Old Testament, viewed in the light of the Incarnation, do not lose their significance when we have accepted the new teaching as to their growth. In the prophets especially we are enabled to see, not so much isolated predictions, such as our fathers saw, such as indeed some of the New Testament writers—as, for example, St. Matthew—saw; predictions, so called, which are sometimes a mere play on words, and cannot fairly be maintained as actual foretellings of future events; but we see in the prophets—and we may reckon the writers of most of the psalms among the prophets—we see an inspired forecast of the teaching and of the saving work of the Messiah, when He should come, as they felt assured He would. The prophets may be said to have become far more intelligible and far more coherent in the light of the higher criticism; while the national history, not contemporaneously recorded save as to isolated events, until about

the time of Hosea, falls into line with the history of other nations; while it presents to us this special feature, that here we have a nation, slowly perceiving that monotheism is the true theology, and that it is by righteousness that the one God must be served. Certainly, so far as the Mosaic law is concerned, the change in the point of view is considerable. For, according to the critics, those chapters of Exodus—21st, 22nd, and 23rd—called the “Book of the Covenant,” may have been written as early as the reign of Ahab, and part at least of the Book of Deuteronomy in the reign of Josiah, about two hundred and fifty years later; but the priestly law, contained in the Book of Leviticus, seems to have been written in Babylonia, about the year 500 B.C.—that is to say, some eight hundred years after the death of Moses, so far as that date can be ascertained.

Time would, of course, fail me if I were to endeavour now to show how this new view as to the dates of the books must affect our estimate of their spiritual value; though it is obvious just to point out that the dates assigned are wholly in accord with what we know of the development of religious ideas and of minutely detailed ceremonial elsewhere; while the early history of Israel in the promised land—the stories of the Judges, for example—affords no evidence whatever of the Mosaic law being then known. It was in the hard school of the Captivity, when “by the waters of Babylon they sat down and wept,” that the dim traditions concerning Moses and Aaron were elaborated into that wonderful code, which was at first a joy and a stay, when it was the expression of real religious convictions, but became a burden, and also a fount of hypocrisy, when the spirit had

departed that once had quickened it, and in the hands of the Pharisees it had degenerated into formal routine.

And now, before I conclude, I should like to quote some words written by Canon Gore shortly before he was made Bishop of Worcester, words which you are not likely to have seen, as they have never been printed in any book. He seems to me to sum up, very clearly and well, the position that in these addresses I have been endeavouring to maintain.

“The difficulty of the subject,” he says, “does not mainly arise because, as is commonly supposed, critical principles, when they are really accepted and applied to the Old Testament, do in themselves produce scepticism as to its inspiration and religious value. They may do so, in particular cases, owing to unfortunate circumstances, just as the same result has followed in certain cases from Tractarian or Evangelical teaching. But, on the whole, it is not true. On the contrary, the preaching of the Old Testament on a critical basis, where the preacher’s own faith in the Divine inspiration of the prophets is real, banishes, and does not create, scepticism. Scepticism as regards the Old Testament is, and has long been, widespread—more widespread than most of the clergy recognise. But it has been bred and fostered by the preaching of the Old Testament on the basis of the uncritical tradition; and criticism, in countless cases, relieves and remedies it. The difficulty, again, does not lie in the supposed fact that children (or grown men and women, if once they will face the question afresh) find it hard to see how tradition and myth and moral tale (as distinguished from strict history) could be the

vehicles of inspired truth. It is easy enough to see how they may be. The real difficulty lies in effecting the transition from one way of looking at the Old Testament to another, in the minds of those, especially teachers and preachers, who have long been accustomed to the old method, and are afraid to part with it.

“Their natural tendency is to refuse to consider the matter afresh, and to seize at once upon certain supposed consequences or excesses of the new method, by way of an excuse for never giving it a real consideration, or for considering it only in a hostile spirit. Once get a man to face it fairly, and I believe he will both be convinced of the width and strength of the basis on which the modern treatment of the Old Testament rests, and also of its power to give a new impulse to the spiritual use of the Old Testament for the proper purposes of the Christian Church.”

These words of Bishop Gore give, I believe, the true account of the matter; and, while those of us who accept the new criticism have no desire to impose it on others, least of all in quarters where it would only give pain and tend to unsettlement, we are bound to maintain it, if only for the sake of coming generations, of whose education it will form a part, and who would as surely be alienated from the faith by being called upon to accept the older view, as you would be if you were told you could not be Christians unless you accepted as a part of Christianity the traditional beliefs which our fathers set aside three hundred and fifty years ago.

For this is no mere fad of experts taking extravagant views, a theory sooner or later to be set aside. If it is the work of experts—that is, in this case, of men who have a thorough knowledge of Hebrew

in all the stages of its development—it is one in which the experts are all agreed; it is confirmed by other evidence, on which, in this short course of lectures, I have been unable to touch; and it has now become a recognised part of the scholarship of the civilised world. Fifty years hence, if not very much sooner, the Bible will be taught in all our schools in accordance with the interpretations of the new criticism.

Its stories will not have lost their power when what is not historical is no longer treated as if it were. The story of the Prodigal Son is true, though it is not true as history; and the same may be said of the early narratives in Genesis. Their truth lies in their spiritual significance; and never have the realities of temptation and sin been more truly portrayed than in the legendary account of the Fall; while all the legends of the Hebrew Scriptures, as becomes the race in which the Son of God should be incarnate, are marked by a dignity and sobriety that you will search for in vain in the corresponding legends of other nations. We do not go to them to learn what actually took place in the prehistoric period; but we do learn from them what the Hebrews believed or imagined about these things, during the centuries of their known history, not more than eight in all, preceding the birth of Christ. There lay far behind them, in the unrecorded past, a much-valued tradition of their deliverance from Egypt under Moses, a great God-provided leader and lawgiver; and to him they dedicated, and in process of time ascribed, what they wrote, as well as what they inherited, concerning those heroic days; and so was gradually formed the great Mosaic legend, which prevailed throughout Judæa at the time

that our Lord was born, and has lasted until our own day. With fuller information, but not without reverence and regret, we are constrained, except so far as concerns its bare outlines, to lay it aside as history; but, in so doing, we do not depart one atom from our faith in Him to whose advent the writers of those Old Testament Scriptures looked forward. We recognise, indeed, more fully the truth of His Manhood, in accepting, as a man of His time, the limitations of His age and of His race; but His spiritual insight, His intimate and eternal communion with the Father, the freshness and incisiveness of His teaching, the attractive power of His death and of His exalted life—all these become to us plainer and more convincing as, through the Scriptures, we come to Him, and find life.

And so it will be, I trust, on the Christmas morning now so near. The Holy Child will not be less but more dear to us as the Saviour, to whose coming witness had long been borne by the prophets and the other inspired writers of the chosen but long-suffering race.

## AUTHORITY AND THE BIBLE

“Quench not the Spirit : despise not prophesyings : prove all things : hold fast that which is good.”—1 THESS. v. 19, 20, 21.

THERE is a famous sentence in one of the anti-Manichæan writings of St. Augustine, which has done more, perhaps, than any other to exalt the idea of Church Authority. “I for my part,” he says, “should not even believe the Gospel were I not moved thereto by the authority of the Catholic Church.” Now the writer of these remarkable words, who in them appears as the great champion of Church Authority, was also, as has been well pointed out by Harnack, the great restorer of Christian piety. That is to say, that ardent expression of religious experience which we find in the epistles of St. Paul is completely silent in the early Church, until we find it restored by St. Augustine in the first thirty years of the fifth century ; and thereafter, to give no other instances, we find it again in St. Bernard in the twelfth century, in the German mystics of the fourteenth century, and then, of course, in Luther, and generally in evangelical Christians since his day. This being so, although St. Augustine was not, like St. Jerome, a biblical critic, we must regard him as being himself a grave authority in support of the position which he appears to maintain in regard to the authority of the Church as guaranteeing to us the truth of the gospel.



On the other hand, we have an equally famous sentence in the writings of our own epoch-making philosopher, Francis Bacon: "Truth is the daughter not of authority but of time"; and this sentence is, of course, more in accordance with the scientific temper of the modern age, which began perhaps with Bacon, regarding truth not so much as an inheritance from the past, as the promised possession of the future.

The problem, then, which I shall now be able only very briefly to state, while also briefly indicating what seems to me the true line to follow with a view to its solution, is this: In regard to the Bible, are we to be guided by Authority, as St. Augustine teaches, or are we to put our trust in Research, as Francis Bacon seems to imply? And the problem is one that touches us who are called "Liberal Churchmen" very closely. As Churchmen we recognise Authority; as Liberals we recognise Research. Can we find a middle term, that will reconcile what, as bluntly stated in the two sentences which I have quoted, seem two diametrically opposed principles? And, before I go further, let me repeat those words of St. Paul that I took for my text, words which I think contain the solution: "Quench not the Spirit: despise not prophesyings: prove all things: hold fast that which is good."

Authority is apt to become discredited, because it is often confused with certain methods in which it may be and has been exercised. We must distinguish between authority and legalism. St. Paul denounced the latter, as inconsistent with the spirit of Christ's religion, yet his frequent quotations from the Old Testament show how he recognised its authority. And similarly, there is a school of legalists, both among ourselves and more notably

and more consistently within the Roman Catholic Church, which would treat of "Authority and the Bible" as concerned mainly with decrees of councils, or other official documents, in which the precise letter and authority of the books of Holy Scripture are thought to have been determined. But this is not the same thing as that Authority of the Church to which St. Augustine appealed, as guaranteeing the truth of the gospel. It is true that in his day there was taking shape a doctrine of literal and verbal inspiration in relation to the New Testament, similar to that which had taken place in the Jewish Church, some centuries earlier, in relation to the Old Testament; a doctrine which has not been without practical value in preserving fairly accurate texts down to the date when printing made the preservation of the text comparatively easy; though the doctrine itself, now that its work is done, is rapidly melting away in the light of modern knowledge and of modern methods of criticism. But the Church Authority to which St. Augustine appealed was rather the great inherited unwritten tradition, which expressed itself in many ways, as the life of the society to which he belonged; it was more what in modern language we should call an "atmosphere" than a collection of legal or conciliar decisions; and to authority of this kind we all live, and rightly live, in submission; indeed, so far from hindering life and freedom, it furnishes the materials on which the soul's life is nourished, and it provides the path in which we can walk at liberty. Let me in this connection read you a passage from Professor Harnack, perhaps the most distinguished liberal theologian of our day, distinguished for sound judgment as well as for learning—

— "There has never yet existed in the world a strong

religious faith which has not appealed at some decisive point or other to an external authority. It is only in the colourless expositions of religious philosophers, or the polemical systems of Protestant theologians, that a faith is constructed which derives its certitude exclusively from our own inner impulses. These undoubtedly constitute the force by which it exists and is preserved. But are not conditions necessary under which this force becomes operative? Jesus Christ appealed to the authority of the Old Testament; ancient Christians to the evidence of prophecy; St. Augustine to the Church; and Luther himself to the written Word of God. Only academic speculation thinks that it can eliminate external authority; life and history show us that no faith is capable of convincing men or of propagating itself, which does not include obedience to an external authority, or fails to be convinced of its absolute power. The only point is to determine the rightful authority, and to discover the just relationship between external and internal authority.”<sup>1</sup> In a later edition Professor Harnack vindicates the position here adopted by saying, “The spiritual man is directly conscious of the Divine Spirit as his Lord, who constrains him to obedience, even where he himself does not perceive the inner authority; but the non-spiritual require some sort of intervening authority, whether consisting in persons, or a book, or a Church. But in both cases we are dealing with a controlling power, whose authority rises above one’s own individuality and knowledge.” He adds that “no fixed line can be drawn between the spiritual and the non-spiritual.” Broadly speaking, therefore, for men in general an authority such as St. Augustine recognised

<sup>1</sup> *History of Dogma*, vol. v. p. 82.

is necessary, not indeed to furnish infallible decisions as to what is in detail the precise language of Scripture or what is its correct interpretation, but to hand it down from age to age, as containing the message of salvation, as the fullest written record of the spiritual experiences of specially favoured men, and as witnessing to the progressive character of Divine revelation. In some such sense as this we accept the Bible, we believe the Gospel, on the authority of the Church; and indeed, without that authority it is not easy to see how it could have come into our hands at all.

But this authority, when thus entrusting us with the Bible, does not assure us that it is all of equal value; that its inspiration is of a wholly different kind from any other inspiration; that its books are to be accepted as the authentic work of the men under whose names they have been transmitted; or that these men, or any other men who were the actual authors, were supernaturally preserved from making any errors in matters of fact in the books which they wrote. Ideas about the Bible such as these undoubtedly have prevailed, and do still to some extent prevail; but they form a kind of "extra-belief," to which no Christian, or Reformed Churchman, as such, is committed; and it is daily becoming less important for us to vindicate our freedom in this matter, because it is rapidly becoming acknowledged on all hands. Every contributor to the literature of the Bible, whether as writer or as speaker, whose words are therein reported, was the child of his own age in all questions relating to history, science, philosophy, and morals; and we find the ideas of his age reproduced in his utterances, which are differentiated only by a loftier spiritual insight, increasingly

manifested until we reach its culmination in Jesus Christ and His nearest disciples. He Himself was not exempt from this most necessary condition. "He knew what was in man"; He knew and revealed the mind of the Father in spiritual things; the Spirit of the Lord was upon Him to heal the broken-hearted and to preach the gospel to the poor; but in all such matters as we are now concerned with—with modern scientific and literary criticism—He was a man of His own age, and necessarily so. Nothing but confusion, intellectual and moral, would have ensued if He had either known these things and announced them, or had known them and concealed them. "Increase in wisdom" implies a limitation of this kind; and it is obviously in accordance with God's dealings with mankind elsewhere, that such limitations should have been.

And here we can see how in modern times a wide field for research has been opened in connection with biblical study. Whether or no the Roman Catholic Church will in course of time acknowledge that this field is legitimately open to her also, it is difficult to say—her written traditions and her traditional temper are unfavourable to any such opening—but there have been signs that in certain quarters such an opening is ardently desired. But in the case of our own Church of England there can be no doubt on the subject. Our Reformers, in rejecting the Latin Vulgate as authentic and throughout canonical, and in falling back, so far as the scholarship of their day allowed them, on what were believed to be Hebrew or Greek originals, vindicated for us their successors the principle that in biblical criticism it is sound learning and not authority that must prevail—sound learning and, let us add, spiritual insight.

Sound learning can deal adequately, and, so far as the materials permit, conclusively, with those details of textual criticism which seem nowadays dull and old-fashioned, though they are none the less most valuable, and demand gifts of patience and observation of a high order. It can also deal effectively and, again within limits, conclusively with those questions of the higher criticism which have to do with the date, authenticity, and homogeneity of documents which, so far as the text is judged only by the authority of existing manuscripts, are not open to this analysis. But there is a further criterion, namely, religious value; and this, which is after all by far the most important, has less to do with sound learning than with spiritual insight; though certainly learning should first present the materials to us, so far as may be, in correct form. Here too it is the spiritually minded layman who is just as well fitted to judge as any clergyman, even though the latter be a profound Hebrew or Greek scholar; and so here comes in the exhortation of St. Paul, addressed to laymen, "Quench not the Spirit: despise not prophesyings: prove all things: hold fast that which is good." Unless a man has very effectually quenched the Spirit in his own soul, he will find no difficulty, however unlearned he may be, in discriminating between the religious value of different portions of the Bible; and a large portion of it he will feel constrained to set on one side, as of no practical value for himself; while, if he has not quenched the Spirit, he will also be slow to despise even the most modern prophesyings, which, accepted with discrimination, often throw so much fresh light on the Bible.

To give only one illustration: "Unto this last." What thousands and thousands of times had those

words been read in cathedrals, and in churches, and in chapels, chanted for centuries as part of one of the Sunday Gospels at High Mass, before John Ruskin arose, a prophet in our dull and foggy England, and, in his little book bearing that title, and based on its significance, published some forty years ago, infused an ethical spirit into economics, and for us originated that widespread and still growing movement which takes shape in such associations as the "Christian Social Union."

It is impossible to deny the immense importance of the subject on which we have but touched to-day. To deal with it at all adequately, not one short sermon but a considerable course of lectures would be required. We who love the Bible, we who hear in it the voices of God-fearing men of old, crying out to us, "Come hither and hearken, all ye that fear God, and we will tell you what He hath done for our souls," we listen with sympathy, as men to whose souls also God has said, "I am thy salvation"; and we have nothing in common with those hostile critics, who greet with contemptuous laughter what they take to be the overthrow of the authority of the Word of God. Neither do we hold with those who would make that authority a burden to a believing but inquiring mind. We are satisfied that literalism, legalism, and obscurantism must no longer encumber the study of the Bible; but yet we must not lose the spiritual treasure which it contains. And where there is faith in Christ, known in history and known in experience,—in history, which remains certain in spite of all that criticism can do, and in experience, wherein a man obtains for himself a clearer certitude than is possible in any other way,—where there is such a faith in Christ, there is nothing in

the conclusions either of modern science or of modern literary analysis, that robs the Bible of its value for our souls. Rather do we, thus enlightened, perceive the better that God's ways are in grace what from the analogy of nature we should have expected—gradual, progressive, ascending.

And so, between Authority and Research as presented by St. Augustine and by Francis Bacon respectively, we seem to have found a middle term that should enable the two to work, as far as may be, in harmony. It is in the unction of the Spirit that we recognise the lubricant lessening the friction. We must not "quench the Spirit," we must not "despise prophesyings," whether in ourselves or in others, if we desire to further the progress of true religion and virtue; we must only discriminate, proving all things and holding fast that which is good. There came into my hands the other day a manual dealing with a theological question, in the preface to which the writer claimed, as the chief merit of his work, that it contained, *he hoped*, "nothing new or original." In other words, he expressed the hope that in his own case he had succeeded in quenching the Spirit. That is the temper we must avoid. It is true that we are tempted to despise prophesyings, because inspiration and revelation, always in their origin interior, have had to struggle into recognition through the voices or the pens of men often ignorant and prejudiced. The thought never gets expression neat; there are always dilutions or disfigurements that have to be cleared away. And this clarifying process is applicable to the old as well as to the new, so that herein Bacon's aphorism is verified, that Truth is the daughter of Time, not of Authority; and, as the world's long day draws to a close, the eastern



mountains of Holy Scripture, freed from clouds, will stand out more clearly in the light of the setting sun. And, guided by authority as well as by research, men until the last great day will search the Scriptures, thinking in them to find "eternal life," and rightly thinking so, if only as they read they come to Him to whom those Scriptures testify, come to Him in faith and in humility, that they may have life, a better and a more useful life here, the earnest and the pledge of an eternal life of rest and adoration hereafter.

## THE SIGNIFICANCE OF ANGLICAN RITUAL

“O worship the Lord in the beauty of holiness.”—Ps. xcvi. 9.

“Let all things be done decently and in order.”—1 COR.  
xiv. 40.

“THE Significance of Anglican Ritual” may seem a singular subject for a sermon preached before the “Churchmen’s Union,” inasmuch as that body does not, primarily at any rate, concern itself with any such matters. Our duty is “to maintain the right and duty of the Church to restate her belief from time to time, as required by the progressive revelation of the Holy Spirit; to uphold the historic comprehensiveness and corporate life of the Church of England, and her Christian spirit of tolerance; to support those who are honestly and loyally endeavouring to vindicate the truths of Christianity by the light of scholarship and research; to assert the rights and duties of the laity as constituent members of the Body of Christ; and to encourage friendly relations between the Church of England and all other Christian bodies.”<sup>22</sup> We may thus seem to have little or no concern in any such question as the significance of ritual, Anglican or other; while we further accept without reserve what is said concerning such matters in the too-little-read Preface to our Prayer-Book: that “the particular Forms of Divine worship,

and the Rites and Ceremonies appointed to be used therein, are things in their own nature indifferent, and alterable, and so acknowledged." On the other hand, all that pertains to the service of God has its importance on that account; and ritual has further this incidental importance, that it has been largely associated with doctrine, and also with certain ideas as to ecclesiastical authority and government; and it is perhaps mainly on this last-named ground that it acquires importance and significance for us.

A bishop vested in cope and mitre and seated on a throne can rarely be depended on as a man in hearty sympathy with the preaching of the simple truths of the gospel of Jesus Christ our Lord, or with the liberal principles which I have just stated as those which it is the special duty of the Churchmen's Union to uphold. As a rule, such a man will be disposed to settle difficult theological problems, not by an appeal to sound learning, not by the recommendation of tolerance and the suspension of judgment, but by an appeal to authority, by a claim to a kind of professional enlightenment, his by virtue of his office, and thus to condemn the bearers of any new light as dangerous misleaders, destined without doubt, unless they change their minds, to "perish everlastingly." But this is not always the case; and as an illustration of what I mean, I cannot do better than recall the memory of the late bishop of this diocese, Dr. Mandell Creighton, who was somewhat of a stickler for Anglican ritual in an ornate form, and wore with dignity a cope and mitre in his Cathedral Church of St. Paul, but who gave to these externals no such sinister significance as that which I have mentioned, inasmuch as his

teaching was always on broad lines. He knew how laymen as well as ecclesiastics could speak with the Spirit "and with the understanding also," and he encouraged no slavish adherence to the letter of ancient formulas, knowing that "God fulfils Himself in many ways," and that to each age Christianity must be presented in a form which the knowledge and spirit of that age best enable it to understand and take to heart. I have mentioned the use of the mitre by the late Bishop Creighton, because that use forms the best illustration of that view of the significance of Anglican ritual which it is my present aim to set before you. What I say will necessarily be no more than a statement in outline of a case that would have to be filled in by many references to history and to the language of distinguished Anglican writers from the days of the Reformation onwards, if it is to be presented in a convincing form; my thesis being that the retention by the Church of England of a certain stateliness and dignity in her ritual, and of some pre-Reformation ornaments and usages, is quite consistent with her being as a Church a teacher of evangelical religion (I do not, of course, mean "evangelical" in a party sense), nor is it inconsistent with the fact that she was established as a reformed and independent Church by an appeal—an active and effective appeal—to those progressive principles which we now maintain. For the use of the mitre by an Anglican bishop is, it must be confessed, an extreme case. The ornament is itself, so far as the Western Church is concerned, purely mediæval, perhaps feudal. It was unknown in this country before the Norman Conquest, and so all its associations are with the fullest hierarchical development of the Middle Ages. The pastoral

staff was explicitly retained by our first reformers, and no one with a taste for symbolism can possibly quarrel with the significance of the pastoral staff. But from the date of the first Prayer-Book of King Edward the Sixth until quite recent years, the mitre has only been a metaphor in the Church of England; and so its modern restoration and use is, as I said, an extreme case, open to question as consistent with Anglican principles, were it not for the well-known broad and spiritual teaching of most of those who have taken part in its revived use. Apart from this, the mitre, worn by what John Keble described as "a crowned and robed seer," certainly suggests, not a pastor of Christ's flock, but an ecclesiastical judge, who, in virtue of his episcopal consecration, and apart from all question of scholarship or of other necessary qualifications, is in a position to pronounce authoritative decisions, which are thenceforth to prevail as ir-reformable. That significance for this particular ornament is not claimed, however, by those who have recently revived its use—certainly it was not claimed by the distinguished prelate, now no longer with us, to whom I have referred by name—and so we may regard its use as merely in accordance with the recognised Anglican tradition of stateliness and dignity in public worship, as belonging to the "beauty of holiness," or the rules for "decency and order," and only inquire whether there were sufficient reasons to warrant its restoration; or, leaving now that particular detail of the mitre on one side, whether there are sufficient reasons for that much larger restoration of ritual and ceremonial display with which they who are interested in these matters are now familiar.

Anglican ritual seems to have been originally intended to distinguish at least three acts of the officiating minister. The gown was to be worn in the pulpit, the surplice in the reading desk, and at the holy table the alb with vestment or cope. With the two former were to be worn the academical hood with the black tippet or scarf; but whether with the latter were to be worn the minor ornaments known as stole and maniple, seems doubtful. There was a reasonableness in these directions. The academic dress of the preacher should betoken the learning that he brings to his task; the white linen of the surplice—itsself only a mediæval vestment, and therefore consistently denounced by the Puritans as a “rag of Popery”—symbolised the purity of life which should mark those who are set apart to lead the faithful in praise and prayer; while the vestments used at the altar represented “antiquity,” and the age of the Fathers, to which the Reformed Church appealed, and appropriately gave a special dignity to the most solemn and primitive of Christian services, to the “Holy Communion and Supper of the Lord,” which traced its origin to the night before He suffered and to the upper room at Jerusalem. Such, apparently, was to have been the Elizabethan settlement of Anglican ritual from the date of the consecration of Archbishop Parker; but, as is well known, the opposition of those advanced reformers, some English and some foreign, who had been accustomed to a much more drastic form of Protestantism in Holland, Germany, or Switzerland, during the reign of Mary, effectually prevented its establishment; and the use of the surplice was all that the Elizabethan bishops were able to secure. At the Restoration, a hundred years later, the Orna-

ments Rubric was retained in a slightly altered form, more as an ideal than as a working rule; and it is only since the Oxford Movement, dating from about the middle of the last century, that what are inaccurately called "the vestments" have been actually used in any number of our churches. And here we are met by an apparent anomaly, similar to that which we have already noticed in the case of the mitre, namely, that the Anglican priest, standing at the holy table in "vestment or cope," stands there in virtue of his having made declarations which denounce in almost violent terms the mediæval doctrine that the priest at the altar "offers Christ for the quick and the dead to have remission of pain or guilt"; and in the prayer that he uses he affirms that Christ on the cross "made there by His one oblation of Himself, once offered, a full, perfect, and sufficient sacrifice, oblation, and satisfaction for the sins of the whole world," an affirmation undoubtedly meant to be taken as a denial of that same mediæval doctrine which before the Reformation had been commonly taught by priests vested much the same as himself; and, with a similar anomaly, the communicants in the Reformed Church were to receive the sacramental bread and wine kneeling, though in the unreformed Church that same kneeling had always been understood as an act of adoration to Christ locally<sup>1</sup> and substantially present beneath the appearances of bread and wine. It sufficed, however, to repudiate such an act of adoration, and to explain that the

<sup>1</sup> Spiritual writers in the Roman Catholic Church repudiate the term "local" as applied to the Presence in the Eucharist. But, none the less, the term is amply warranted by the Presence being commonly spoken of as "on the altar" or "in the tabernacle," and by the popular belief.

kneeling at that time was retained "for a significance of our humble and grateful acknowledgment of the benefits of Christ therein given to all worthy receivers, and for the avoiding of such profanation and disorder in the Holy Communion as might otherwise ensue." Our Church of England, it would thus appear, does not avail herself of ceremonial to "establish any doctrine"; but she has regard to what is comely and what is orderly, not being affected by any superstitious dread of ceremonial, as if it were in itself an evil and a dangerous thing, but confident that the strength and the reasonableness of the simple gospel teaching, which is so apparent in the language of the Prayer-Book, is in no risk of being set aside by such small matters as a candle or a vestment or a bended knee. It would be well if all those who proclaim the same teaching to-day had similarly the courage of their convictions, and were free from that unreasonable terror which so often seems to blind them to the beauty and the appropriateness and the educational value of many of the details of Catholic ceremonial. Their lack of the æsthetic sense is perhaps what prevents them from appreciating these things for what they are worth; and they could learn a useful lesson from Wordsworth or from Dr. Arnold of Rugby, who thought that as a nation we are spiritually the losers because we have no crucifixes set up in public places; or from his son, Matthew Arnold, no dogmatic teacher certainly, who held that picturesque ritual of the Catholic type was a real help to the devotional spirit in man, and, as such, would last as long as man lasts. But perhaps the poetic lament of Wordsworth expresses more precisely what is the growing temper of our time in regard to religious symbolism—



" Would that our scrupulous sires had dared to leave  
 Less scanty measure of those graceful rites  
 And usages, whose due return invites  
 A stir of mind too natural to deceive ;  
 Giving to Memory help when she would weave  
 A crown for Hope."

It cannot be denied that what is called the "Ornaments Rubric" in our Prayer-Book—that is, the rubric which directs the use at the holy table of such vestments as were authorised under the first Prayer-Book of King Edward the Sixth—presents a difficult problem to students of the genius of the Church of England. Some, as we know, inspired by the sacerdotal teaching of the Oxford Movement, find in it a permission to go back to pretty nearly all the beliefs and practices of the Middle Ages. Others, convinced (and rightly convinced) by the language of the Prayer-Book and Articles throughout, that this cannot be its meaning, fly to the opposite extreme, and, treating it as a dead letter (such as it undoubtedly was both after the accession of Elizabeth and after the Restoration of Charles the Second, until about the year 1850), deny its legal force, though at the same time they do not attempt to vindicate this view of its nullity in a court of law. I believe that the true key to its significance will be found in the history and practice of the Scandinavian Churches. These Churches were reformed some five-and-twenty years before ours, and on conservative lines, which included the retention of episcopal organisation and of a large portion of the ancient ceremonial. The use thus established has not, it is true, been preserved with complete uniformity until the present day ; but, as a rule, if you attend now the service in a Danish, Swedish, or Norwegian church, you will find that the doctrine preached

from the pulpit by a pastor wearing a black gown is uniformly on broad evangelical lines; while the same pastor, when he celebrates the Holy Communion, stands before an altar on which is placed a crucifix between two lighted candles, he himself wearing "eucharistic vestments" such as our *Ornaments Rubric* prescribes. The Reformation carried out in these countries on these conservative lines was eminently successful in holding the people together. In Norway, and I think it was also the same in Denmark and in Sweden, there were no dissenters from the National Church, either on the Roman or the Puritan side, for more than three centuries. This, of course, could not have been foreseen by our reformers; but they could not fail to know in 1558 how this respect for the ancient organisation and for certain innocent usages had for some five-and-twenty years prevented a breach of religious unity in national Churches across the sea; and, as a similarly conservative spirit is consonant with our national character, it was but reasonable to suppose that the same methods would in England secure the same result. And this might very well have been the case but for the temporary Marian restoration of the old system, which provoked such strong feeling on either side, and was destined in Elizabeth's reign to oppose both Romans and Puritans to the Anglican *via media*; a state of things that has lasted down to our own days, and will last longer.

Meanwhile, holding this middle place, and enjoying therein a spiritual freedom such as seems to be unattainable elsewhere—and this we can say without Pharisaism or boasting, for the freedom gained is not our own achievement but an inheritance from those who have gone before—there seems no

reason why we should not go on hopefully and joyfully, in submission to the authentic teaching of our Master and Saviour, and learning to know Him better as we study and discriminate in His reflected teaching, which we find in the lives and the writings of His closest disciples, whether in ancient or modern times. Our Church is itself, we believe, in many ways an admirable reflection of His teaching, and especially of His "sweet reasonableness," in showing a due sense of proportion, and in not making too much account of little things, yet not despising them altogether. That which has been our subject to-day is one of these little things; yet, regarded as an aspect of the poetry of the soul, it is not without importance; and undoubtedly it contributes towards that "impressiveness" of Divine worship, of which so much account is now made. But the beauty of worship must be "the beauty of holiness" if it is to make any true or lasting impression. God forbid that our Church of England services should ever be degraded to the level of a stage-play, in which fine effects are produced, while the whole is at bottom only "make-believe." That can never be so long as God calls "fit persons to serve in the sacred ministry of His Church," men replenished with truth of doctrine and endued with innocency of life. For a true succession of such men we do well to pray, striving also that the door may be more widely opened to receive them; for this freedom the circumstances of our time imperatively demand.

## THE RITSCHLIAN THEOLOGY AND ITS RELATION TO MYSTICISM

YOU will pardon me if I begin my paper with a few words of personal explanation. Thirty years ago, or thereabouts, I was a student of the traditional Anglican theology at Oxford, and twenty years ago, or thereabouts, I was a student of Roman Catholic theology at Birmingham. In both systems there is much to admire, and I need hardly say that I think of both with respect and sympathy. But for the last fifteen years or so both of these systems have seemed to me to lack cogency. Both of them depend on the principle of authority: in the one case the authority being that of the so-called "undivided Church"; in the other, more consistently, that of the contemporary living Church.

But in either case the principle breaks down, partly through its own essential insufficiency, and partly under the disintegrating influence of modern historical criticism; and a new and sounder basis has to be looked for elsewhere; that is to say, it has to be looked for, if, as we are all agreed, it is desirable that mankind should continually be enabled to learn the things of the Spirit through the medium of Christ. The cultivated world has wandered very far away from these things. Modern science and modern criticism, aided to some extent by the comparative study of religion, have led men

to doubt whether any good is any longer to be got out of Christianity, however understood; and I do not think that, generally speaking, men will in the future have recourse to the principle of authority in the things which concern the spirit.

But a way out of an agnostic materialism, which is practically the same as atheism, is, in the judgment of not a few thoughtful people, to be found in the theological system of Albrecht Ritschl on the one hand, and in the leading ideas of mysticism on the other; while the difficulty that I have undertaken to deal with to-day is that Ritschl repudiates mysticism. And it will be my aim to show that while Ritschlianism really leads up to and involves an acceptance of the first principles of mysticism, what Ritschl repudiates is, not those first principles, but certain accidental extravagances which he confounds with them. I discuss the matter, as best I can, from the point of view of one who believes he has found a firm basis for an edifice of spiritual faith in a combination of Ritschl's method with the mystical apprehension of fundamental truth; and that is my excuse for having written a paper on the subject.

First, then, who was Ritschl, and what are his claims on our attention?

Albrecht Ritschl, who was born in 1822, and who died in 1889, was the son of a Lutheran bishop, and was educated for the ministry at Bonn and at Halle. Let me also say of him at once, that you may not think of him as a mere dry-as-dust theologian, that he inherited from his mother a sharp and lively nature, and a great love for music. Of course, as a German student, he was bound to come under the influence of Hegel, but an Hegelian he never was. So far as he was a disciple of any philo-

sopher, he was a follower of Immanuel Kant; and if we are to name any one theologian whose line he followed and developed, that one would be the spiritual interpreter of Christianity, Schleiermacher. But he was a man of too great independence of judgment to be classed as a follower of any one teacher, philosophical or theological; and this independent spirit his followers have largely inherited from him; and no one, I think I may say, is a Ritschlian who has not in some degree departed from his master's teaching. The Ritschlian school is not one in which the words *ipse dixit* can drive the disciples into silence or retractation.

At the age of twenty-three he came under the influence of Baur and the Tübingen school of destructive biblical criticism; but it speaks much for his courage, as well as for his literary insight, that in the course of years he came to see that this school was extravagant and wanton in its negations; and he was perhaps the first to brave the contempt always showered on students whose conclusions may be stigmatised as reactionary, and to acknowledge as authentic sundry New Testament documents that the best and latest scholarship now admits to be authentic.

During the period of his connection with the Tübingen school he wrote a book on *The Origin of the Ancient Catholic Church*, of which Harnack, the greatest living authority, says that "its principles have found acceptance, if not with all, yet with the majority of independent critics." Professor Orr describes it as "epoch-making." "It is," he says, "one of the best that Ritschl ever wrote; and in its revised form, allowance being made for advance of knowledge on points of detail, it retains its interest and value almost unimpaired till the present

hour. It lays down the lines for the study of the earliest age of Christianity, which the best scholarship has since followed." This book was first published in 1850, and the revised edition, by which he definitely severed his connection with the Tübingen school, in 1857. Fearlessness in revising his own work was always a characteristic of Ritschl, and it is not in my judgment a characteristic that lays him open to reproach, though it has had that effect in many quarters. It was throughout his aim to keep an open mind for the reception of new light from whatever quarter it might come; and this is perhaps part of the secret of the influence he has undoubtedly had.

Ritschl ascribes the growth of those hierarchical and sacerdotal ideas, which we find in the early Catholic Church but do not find in the New Testament, to the remarkable failure of the early Church to understand St. Paul, a mystic with a mind stored with Jewish learning, who was perhaps inevitably unintelligible to the Gentile converts, whether Greek or Latin, who so soon formed the main body of the Christian Church. Others besides Ritschl have noted this failure, not only on the part of the early Church, but on the part of the later and mediæval Church as well, right down to the date of the Reformation; though doubtless there were kindred mystic spirits here and there, like St. Augustine, who understood him and were enlightened by him. It is of the Church as a whole that the failure is noted. And to understand Ritschl rightly, we must remember that he was an enthusiastic Lutheran; not indeed a servile follower of the Reformer in all the details of his teaching, but one who recognised in Luther the discoverer of the spiritual teaching of St. Paul, and who claimed

himself to be a discoverer, or at any rate a re-stater, of Luther's interpretation of that teaching.

Now there is much in the conventional phraseology of Lutheranism that is repugnant to us, because of associations which go along with it in our minds; and we may be deterred from admitting or realising its essential truth on that account. I confess that I always shrank from the jargon about "justification" and "reconciliation," until I perceived that it is only a clumsy way of saying "forgiveness"; and that the volumes and volumes that have dealt with the subject, with all the burden of technical phraseology that a learned theology is so well able to supply, can be completely summed up in the few lines that tell the beautiful story of the Prodigal Son. Moreover, Ritschl's German is admitted on all hands to be exceptionally cumbrous and obscure; so that his influence must mainly be traced to a few especially illuminating ideas that have been accepted with enthusiasm, as of immense value, and even of necessity, in the peculiar intellectual condition of our times.

That his influence has been both deep and widely extended is undeniable. This is what Professor Orr says about the spread of Ritschlianism: "The rapid rise, extensive spread, and dominant influence of this movement admittedly constitute it the most remarkable phenomenon in the recent history of religious thought. . . . Already the disciples of Ritschl hold chairs in all the leading universities of Germany; and the ideas, and still more the spirit of his teaching, are recognised as the reigning influences in continental theology, and are rapidly penetrating theological thought in Britain and America as well"; and it is not necessary to add that the eminence of Ritschl's school on the Continent



is sufficiently attested by the well-known names of Harnack and Kattenbusch in Germany and of Sabatier in Paris; and many other less familiar names might be added to them.

If I now endeavour to sketch in outline the Ritschlian theology, it must be with the reservation that this sketch only represents my own impressions concerning that part of it which has interested me. Indeed I could not give any full and complete account of Ritschlianism as a whole, if only for the reason that different disciples of Ritschl interpret him differently.

I understand, then, first of all, that he accepts fully and frankly all the conclusions of the new learning of our day, in regard to the materials out of which a theological system may be built; and that he also accepts by anticipation, as in the nature of things powerless to destroy the basis on which he builds, all conclusions to which a yet newer learning still to come might hereafter point. I mention this, because, when I go on presently to state that Ritschl's basis is largely historical, the objection may be raised that we never can be sure—absolutely sure—that the discovery of new documents may not make it necessary for us to revise beliefs that are based on the evidence of alleged historical occurrences. We have recently had a warning of this in the discovery of the documents entitled the "Teaching of the Twelve," the "Gospel of Peter," and the "Sayings of Jesus"—these last being only fragments of works that apparently have perished. The sands of Egypt might conceivably yield in the future texts that would explain the origin, perhaps the mythical origin, of some portions of the New Testament narrative that we have hitherto regarded as historical. To

this I think Ritschl and most of his disciples would reply, that Christianity, as they understand it, does not rest on the authenticity of any particular incident, but on the underlying truth to the facts of human nature, mirrored in the Christian ideals which undoubtedly possessed the minds and souls of those to whom the origins of Christianity are traced: in other words, on the correspondence with undoubted truths of human nature of those Christian ideas and ideals which (whether correctly associated or not with the names of Jesus, Paul, and John) did at any rate rise into prominence and gain commanding influence in the first two centuries of our era. Safeguarding itself in this way against the subtle suggestion of a possible overthrow hereafter, Ritschlianism insists, and as I think quite rightly, on the solidity of the historic basis on which it builds. Of biblical inspiration in the older and mechanical sense of the term it knows nothing, but it places a high value on the Old Testament literature, as a necessary introduction to New Testament Christian ideas; and it places a similarly unique value on the New Testament literature, as the mirror in which we see reflected the teaching and the beliefs of Christ and of His apostles. That, in the true spirit of Protestantism, Ritschl stops short here, and insists on the Bible, and the Bible only, as the source from which Christian theology is to be derived, I take to be a weakness in his system. To him Church History is from the very first the history of a great apostasy, until Luther arose to explain what St. Paul meant; possibly also until Ritschl arose to explain what Luther meant; and this narrow conception, though it is valuable as bringing men back to the fountainhead, and in insisting on their

studying the pure and primitive doctrine of Christ, is none the less to be deplored, and, as I think, to be rejected in favour of a more liberal conception, that sees and welcomes congruous and congenial additions to Christian thought and idealism supplied by men and women who, throughout the nineteen Christian centuries, have been touched by the spirit of Christ and have recorded what Christianity meant to them.

Apart from this, however, it is surely of service in the present day that a theological leader should frankly accept the conclusions of modern scholarship in regard to the date and authorship of the books of the Bible, conclusions which leave absolutely untouched the value of its narratives for allegorical and spiritual interpretation, while they lift, for example, a heavy burden from the mind of the intelligent reader, who cannot possibly accommodate his historical sense to the notion, so elaborately stated in the books of the Pentateuch, of a ceremonial law taught to the Israelites as of Divine authority in the very earliest and semi-barbarous stage of their religious history. The Ritschlian is free to study the Old Testament on modern lines; and, thus regarded, it becomes a proper historical pedestal on which Christ and His religion stand. And the New Testament the Ritschlian similarly studies with an open mind, not vexing his soul about details which modern criticism feels bound to question, but secure in the assurance that, taken as a whole, its historical value is now much less open to question than it seemed to be forty or fifty years ago. Some recent words of Harnack, in his *Chronology of the Ancient Christian Literature*, are worth quoting in support of this estimate: "A time will come, and it is

already drawing near, in which men will not trouble themselves much more about the working out of problems of literary history in the region of primitive Christianity, because whatever can be made out about them will have acquired general assent, namely, the essential accuracy of the tradition with but few important exceptions. . . . There was a time—the great mass of the public are still living in such a time—in which people felt obliged to regard the oldest Christian literature, including the New Testament, as a tissue of deceptions and falsifications. That time has passed.” The public here spoken of is of course the German public, which has been so largely influenced by the destructive ideas of Strauss. Our public at home, apart from the disciples of certain secularist leaders, has been very little touched by such ideas, so it has much less to unlearn. In any case, this vigorous statement of the conservative conclusions of the later and higher criticism is of no little interest and value.

In relation to the miraculous, or the alleged miraculous, Ritschl sees, as we all see, that the modern man cannot accept miracle as a direct contravention of natural law, the recognition of which lies at the root of all scientific investigation; but he plainly recognises that, in proportion to the exceptional character of a man's personality, so may effects be anticipated that the average observer would describe as miraculous, since a refined intelligence and a clearly balanced judgment are necessary if we are to distinguish between contravening and transcending. And on that account it is necessary for us, as a preliminary, to apprehend the Personality of Christ, before we begin to criticise the miraculous atmosphere in which He is represented as moving. With this preparation, and guided

by the principle that, though the impossible does not happen, and that if you mean by miracles the impossible, then miracles do not happen, yet that the exceptional and the abnormal do happen, and under conditions worthy of the occasion may well be expected to happen, Ritschl is justified in claiming for the beginning and the ending of Christ's visible life on earth that they were "manifestations of the exceptional position of His Person." Into fuller detail it is not possible now to go; but it was necessary to say as much as this, if I am to give a fair account of what I understand by Ritschlianism.

The third crucial point, wherein breadth of view is as imperatively demanded by the mind that has been touched by the modern spirit as it is in the case of Scripture or in the case of miracle, is the account a man gives of the conclusions he bases on the comparative study of religions. And here I do not find in Ritschl much response. Whether the subject was never prominently before his mind, or whether he took for granted without stating it that a liberal doctrine in this matter is not only imperatively demanded by modern knowledge, but is also freely conceded by all Christian thinkers, I do not know. What, however, seems to be in this matter consonant with the teaching of Ritschl in other departments, would be something like this: The spirit of man has never been left without witness by the Spirit of God, from whatever moment we date the infusion of that Spirit, whether into the race or into the individual. And so, when critics of Christianity insist on the lofty spiritual teachings of a date long anterior to Christ or even to the rise of Judaism, teachings that influenced vast populations in the far Eastern world, and that have left records now at last published and made known

in our Western world, we may admit all that can be established in this matter, and indeed go further, and hold that even where no records at all have been preserved, possibly because in the remotely primitive era that we have now in mind no records were attempted or were possible, the very first men who could be recognised as men had, in proportion to their development, a spiritual enlightenment that was most valuable to them; maintaining also, that while this idea is undoubtedly of extreme interest, it has little or no positive value when the question before us is of the spiritual enlightenment and training of ourselves and of the men and women of to-day. And so Ritschl seems to have left all this question on one side, devoting his energies exclusively to the setting up again on high, in the sight of the men of his own generation and of his own land, the one Name that can be counted upon to evoke spiritual warmth and light in the souls of those who are brought here and now into contact with it.

For if it be true that the modern world is suffering from the fact that knowledge of God has over a wide area retreated like an ebbing tide, leaving a sandy, barren waste over which the waters seem unwilling to return; and if it be true that, as we hold, a return of this knowledge is most desirable,—then there can be no doubt as to the Name through which alone that knowledge must be re-inspired. Whether in London clubs or in London slums, you will accomplish little—I do not say you will accomplish nothing—if you preach Mahomet or Confucius, Zoroaster or Buddha; but we have clear and convincing evidence to-day, such as there has been throughout the whole history of nineteen centuries in our Western world, and to a limited

extent even in the Eastern world, that you may expect to accomplish much if you are able again, with new knowledge and new zeal, to preach the name of Christ.

And that is precisely what Ritschl has done. I make no pretence to deal with his theological system in detail; I am only calling attention to one special feature in it, because on what we make of that special feature will depend our view of the relation between Ritschlian theology and mysticism. He makes religion to consist essentially in man's communion with the historical Christ, who, he says, is the perfect revelation of God to men. In his own peculiar phraseology, Christ has to us the "religious value" of God. An idea of this kind is surely very consonant with Christ's own teaching: "No man cometh unto the Father but by Me." "He that hath seen Me hath seen the Father." And Ritschl has a special and peculiar explanation of the way in which he who has been led to the feet of the historical Christ apprehends Him in such fashion as to become a Christian, and to secure all the privileges of membership in Christ's kingdom.

His teaching is that the soul of man has a faculty enabling it to judge on that which is "of religious value" for itself; and that this operation of judging, belonging as it does to the sphere of human consciousness, is for the man who makes it an act involving certitude. In his theory of knowledge, he distinguishes these "judgments of value" from "theoretic judgments," the main distinction being that while the latter are merely intellectual, the former are essentially moral. It is easier, perhaps, to admit that in this contention of his Ritschl is arguing for an important and not unfamiliar truth,

than to allow that his technical definition of it makes the matter any clearer than it was before. At any rate, as I understand him, Ritschl is really pleading for the truth and value of spiritual experience, and his theological system may be described as a new and necessary rational school-master to bring men to Christ (the old Jewish law having long since ceased to discharge that function); and there he leaves them, declining to carry his work any further.

Here we reach the point at which, in my judgment, Ritschlianism becomes unsatisfactory. His repudiation of mysticism, if we are to take it as literal and final, and his insistence on religion as consisting in the soul's communion with the historical Christ, these two, following upon his teaching about the soul's enlightenment by the "judgment of value," imply, so far as I can see, a somewhat lame and impotent conclusion. He laboriously leads men to Christ the Door; for one moment he allows them to see through the door into the land of spiritual blessedness beyond, but he then slams the door in their faces, saying, "No admission, gentlemen; communion with the historical door from the outside is all that my system allows."

I shall be glad to find that I have misunderstood him in this matter; for the permanent importance of his work and influence, admittedly so great, seems to me to depend on whether he does or does not give us an "open Door," through which a man may not only "enter in and be saved," but may also thereafter, enjoying spiritual freedom, "go in and out and find pasture." Of course, he cannot hinder this freedom if he would; it does not depend on him; but it would add immensely to the value



and significance of his teaching if it could be shown that this is a necessary part of it.

But of the explicit repudiation of mysticism by Ritschl, and by some of his more prominent disciples, there can be no doubt. Professor Orr even thinks that Ritschl desired to dissociate religion from metaphysics mainly for the reason that he would thus be enabled to deal a blow at everything of the nature of mysticism. He taught, according to Orr, that the soul exists only in its functions of thinking, feeling, and willing; and that the idea of its being an abiding something in the midst of its manifestations was a scholastic fiction. This view would no doubt make impossible the mystic union of the soul with God. But Orr points out in a footnote that Ritschl did not consistently adhere to this negative doctrine, and that it is not reconcilable with ideas about personality which he certainly did hold. So that his language on this point may have been misunderstood.

A similar criticism may be made on the anti-mystical bias of Herrmann, one of Ritschl's most devoted followers. The first book of his treatise on *The Communion of the Christian with God* is entitled "Christianity *versus* Mysticism," and thirty pages are devoted to this subject. He speaks very respectfully of Catholic mysticism, but he maintains none the less that neither it nor any other form of mysticism is Christian; and he concludes with expressions of filial devotion to his master, Luther, for whom he at the same time apologises as a "simple-hearted and unconscious heir of Catholic theology." But there are passages in this essay, so to term it, that are very consonant with the spirit of mysticism, and that make one question whether he is not really repudiating something

else all the time. Let me quote some remarkable words: "We are at one in the conviction that the inner life of religion is a secret in the soul, and cannot be handed over from one to another. No human being can so help another by the information he may give him, that the latter shall be put in possession of what is best in religion. Each individual must experience it for himself as a gift from above. Every man to whom religion is something more than a store of knowledge or a burden of commandments, experiences at times a certain stirring of feeling within him, amid which he alone is able to gain due profit from all that is of religious significance. The man who is acquainted with these movings within, knows also that he needs neither special reflection nor instruction to explain them. He has, on the contrary, so strong a sense of being possessed, as it were, that he must say, 'This is God.' At such a time God makes Himself felt, and sets the man in that inward condition which is blessedness. In this frame of mind the words 'God is present' are the simple expression of the simple experience."

Now, if this is the language of an anti-mystic, I can only say that it is the language of a very bad one. Nevertheless, Professor Orr, noticing this book, which, it must be remembered, is an elaborate exposition of the Ritschlian doctrine that the communion of the Christian with God is through the medium of the historical Christ, comes to the conclusion that Herrmann denies a direct access of God to the soul.

The inevitable inference seems to be this, that Ritschl and his disciples have not succeeded in making themselves clear on this point; for, while they are protesting against mysticism, they seem all the time to be mystics themselves.

And indeed, what is that "judgment of value," which is the pivot on which the whole of the Ritschlian system depends, if it is not a mystical apprehension of spiritual truth by the soul? I do not wish to go back to that point, but we should notice that, according to Ritschl, the man who, brought to the feet of Christ, makes the "value-judgment" by which he constitutes himself His disciple, thereby attains "spiritual freedom," or, as he otherwise expresses it, "lordship over the world." Surely this, again, is very near akin to mysticism. So that when in another place we find Ritschl explaining his aversion to mysticism as due to his dread that it might lead "to every form of fanaticism," a light seems to be thrown on the ambiguity of his position. I said that to understand Ritschl we must remember that he was an enthusiastic Lutheran; and if Ritschl poses as an anti-mystic, it is probably from loyalty to Luther, who was compelled to take an attitude of strong hostility to contemporary Protestant mysticism, because it did degenerate into fanaticism of a dangerous kind. I speak under correction, but I think that in the eighth book of Vaughan's *Hours with the Mystics*, where he deals with "Theosophy in the Age of the Reformation," we find the historical genesis of Ritschl's anti-mystical bias, or rather of his utterances against mysticism; for that he was himself essentially, although unconsciously, a mystic, I think I have given some proof. The Anabaptists of Münster, the prophets of Zwickau, Bodenstein of Carlstadt, and Sebastian Frank, the revolutionary turbulence of the former and the contest with Luther of the latter, these things explain the nervous suspicion of mysticism as a probable fount of fanaticism, which Ritschl by

his Lutheran birth and training had inherited. Towards mysticism as an inexhaustible fount of spiritual life, and as necessarily and indispensably lying at the root of all true religion and piety, his attitude, and the attitude of his disciples, would surely be very different. And indeed it is in reality different. I have already quoted from Herrmann; let me now quote this sentence from Kaftan: "In Christian piety we seek communion with the Divine Spirit and life. We are aware that we can find blessedness only in this direct communion, and that on the heights of the inner world of faith all thought of any kind of mediation vanishes." And Harnack speaks of "the Spirit, as a possession and principle of the new supernatural life and of holiness." These passages must suffice to show what at any rate is one aspect of the Ritschlian theology; and that it is not opposed to mysticism is, I believe, actually the thesis of another disciple of Ritschl's, named Reischle, who has also published articles on the subject which I have not seen.

The question, however inadequately I may have handled it, is surely a not unimportant one. If Professor Orr is right in his estimate of Ritschlianism, as the flowing theological tide in Germany, and to some extent also elsewhere, we at the same time cannot be ignorant that there is another tide flowing contemporaneously, namely, that of Christian mysticism. The evidence of this may be seen in many quarters. The writer of a remarkable article in a recent number of the *Quarterly*, on "The Ethics Religious Conformity," in his last sentence shows plainly that the whole motive for his writing it lay in his recognition of the fact that in the revival of mysticism lies the promise of a great future for a revived Christian

theology of a very liberal type, for which he hopes to see secured a home and a mission field in the National Church. The Bampton Lectures at Oxford in the same year were on the History of Christian Mysticism; and from time to time one learns, perhaps with surprise, that men and women of eminence in the literary world, or distinguished in art, or perhaps even in science, have testified to their growing realisation of the indispensable importance of the mystical element in religion. A dry acquiescence in authority, and submission to a teaching Church, is giving way before the conviction that the religion of the individual must be based on his own experience, and that, when he has gained this experience, he had best find sympathy and fellowship in a Church that not only teaches but learns.

And if these things are so, if the two currents are really flowing contemporaneously, it will be well if they also flow together, so that the one shall serve to swell the volume of the other. The new German theology may seem unimportant and uninteresting to the experienced mystic; but yet, when fairly considered, it should be of immense interest and importance. Its mission is to bring people to the Door. Unless we are so selfish and narrow as to be content that the knowledge and enjoyment of spiritual things shall be confined to a select few, to coteries of disciples here and there, we must desire that all men should be brought to the Door, however far out of the way they may seem to be at the present moment. For those that are far away, the reasonableness and simplicity of the Ritschlian theology, as I have described it in outline, should be of the greatest service. By concentrating attention on the winning figure of the

historical Christ, and by postponing the consideration of subsidiary matters concerning which difficulties might be raised, it opens the way for the rationalist, and for the believer in the supremacy of ethics, to recognise a personal Ideal, whose contact gives to morality the necessary quickening of emotion. That Ritschlianism rightly understood—by which I mean, not burdened with all the details of technical language and of elaborate systematisation of which our Teutonic brethren seem often so strangely fond—may bring many endowed with an honest and good heart to the Door, seems to me a thing most certain; and I look to his French rather than to his German disciples to give us such an account of the system as may render it more attractive than in its present dress it is to our own countrymen. If I rightly understand the matter, Renan, if a little more serious, might have become a Ritschlian; and if only someone with a style like Renan's would take the matter in hand, very considerable results would follow. There exists already a Ritschlian work by a Frenchman, Bertrand, entitled *A New View of the Redemption*; and Sabatier's little work on *The Vitality of Christian Dogma* is also on Ritschlian lines; but something more seems yet to be needed. When, the other day, one of our most distinguished Hebrew scholars, a most devout Christian, and a man who has made a theological tour somewhat similar to my own, said to me incidentally, "I owe everything to Ritschl," it became clear to me how great a power there must be in a statement of the case for Christianity that could so influence a really powerful heart and mind.

Perhaps the power of Ritschlianism to influence men of the modern intellectual world lies partly in the fact that in its *prolegomena* it is much on

the same lines as Positivism. Both repudiate metaphysics, in so far as it is possible to repudiate them—for we cannot escape from them altogether; both appeal to history, and use the historical method; and both insist on the importance of the feelings in the conduct of life. Possibly the resemblance might be traced in further detail, but this will suffice. In other ways the two systems are of course sharply contrasted; but this is partly due to the difference in the intellectual temper of the two periods in which they were respectively thought out. Comte has no place for anything that can be called miraculous or even transcendental; nor could he find any place for Jesus of Nazareth in his new religious Calendar. Both these things were natural enough in the later years of the first half of the last century, when physical science was supposed to be on the eve of explaining everything, and the criticisms of Strauss were thought to have reduced Jesus to a myth. Ritschl lived on into a period of less confident negations, with the result that he makes the greatness of St. Paul intelligible, in that Paul did not build (as Comte would have had us believe that he built) on a foundation of faith in a charlatan, whose very existence was open to question.

St. Paul is, in fact, the justification of Ritschlianism, regarded, as we have regarded it, as leading to a mystic apprehension of Divine truth. Through his fortnight's stay with St. Peter, and presumably through other opportunities, he knew the historical Christ, and he formed on Him, as the revelation of God to himself, an enthusiastic "judgment of value," to use the Ritschlian formula. But he did not stop there; and I should be entering on a very wide field if I were to attempt to point out in detail how St. Paul may be said to have passed from

a Ritschlian to a mystical apprehension of Christianity. And I have completed, so far as I am competent, the exposition of the idea with which I began. Ritschl's nervous dread of mysticism, as liable to lead to "all kinds of fanaticism," I have explained as due to his taking account, too much account, of what it actually did lead to at the period of the Reformation. But that was largely due to lack of knowledge and education in the men who were then affected by mystical ideas. A mystic, when he becomes such, does not become an entirely new man. He takes with him the intellectual baggage of his early creed and training; and if he thus takes with him much that is morally and intellectually unsound, no wonder if disastrous developments result, should he be unable readily to distinguish between what he knows by direct spiritual perception and what he has learnt as other men learn. But this danger is one that disappears as sound learning increases; and it is a part of the hopeful prospect that is now in view, that the kind of men that Ritschlianism may be expected to influence and to lead to Christ, the Door, will be such as will do no damage to the reputation of mysticism in regard to knowledge and sobriety of judgment, if in due course they experience its power.

Knowledge touched by feeling, and so led on to spiritual insight—that is the sum of what I have tried to say; and it is really all comprehended in the one sentence of St. Paul: "That I may know Him, and the power of His resurrection."



## THE PERMANENT ELEMENT IN THEOLOGICAL RE-STATEMENT

WHAT do we mean by "theological re-statement"? It is a question that it is necessary to ask, because even in well-informed quarters the thing is not understood. Even the *Westminster Gazette*, when it published an interview with the late Mr. Haweis, made him say that in his opinion "the old theology must be *re-instated*," which was, I suppose, the very reverse of his opinion. "Re-statement" is not "re-instatement." Whenever the crude literal significance, although undoubtedly the original sense, of old theological formulas, is tacitly allowed to fall into the background, and a more spiritual interpretation takes its place, this is a "re-statement"; and this has undoubtedly occurred, so far at least as all educated people are concerned, in regard to some clauses in the Apostle's Creed: "He descended into hell; . . . He ascended into heaven; He sitteth on the right hand of God the Father Almighty. . . . I believe in the resurrection of the body." It is certain that these clauses originally had a crude material and local significance, which later knowledge and a better appreciation of the language of Scripture have both compelled and allowed us to set aside. Similarly, though not precisely on the same lines, the first sense of the words in the same Creed, "the living and the dead," has, in the Roman Catholic Church at least, been set aside in favour of an

interpretation which makes the words mean, "those who are spiritually alive in grace or dead in sin"; because certain texts in the Vulgate version support the view universally held in the Roman Catholic Church, that all men will have died before the judgment day. This, of course, was not the belief of St. Paul, nor of the early Christians generally. So here we have a notable instance of tacit re-statement, giving a new sense to an ancient formula. And in the Roman Catholic "Penny Catechism" we have a still more remarkable example of re-statement; for there words have been added, "Six days *or periods*," to call attention to the new sense now allowed to be placed on the word "day" in the first chapter of Genesis.

And as I have mentioned the "Penny Catechism," let me in passing pay a tribute to its excellence. It has certain advantages over our Prayer-Book Catechism in being fuller, clearer, and more methodically arranged; and if the "Free Church Catechism" and the "Penny Catechism" could be amalgamated and liberalised, and authorised for use in the Church of England, we should have a manual for the instruction of our children far more illuminating and sustaining than that which we now possess; though I am not, of course, blind to its great and obvious merits.

Now this addition of the words, "or periods," is undoubtedly a remarkable example of re-statement. For the author of the first chapter of Genesis certainly meant "days," in the ordinary sense of the term. And from the date that he wrote up to about the year 1850, the idea of the literal week of creation was held with practically universal consent by both Jewish and Christian Churchmen. The wider interpretation of a few mystical writers can hardly be

said to have disturbed this universality, for their allegorising assumed an original literal truth of the narratives which they thus expounded. So that, in the year 1850, it would truly be said of the seven literal days of creation that this belief had been held *semper, ubique, et ab omnibus*. And yet, because such a belief was recognised by well-informed ecclesiastics, some five-and-twenty years later, as irreconcilable with modern and well-ascertained knowledge, the "re-statement" was very justly made.

Re-statement is thus a practical acknowledgment that the Church is a learner as well as a teacher. What was formerly credible in a literal sense, and indeed in that sense seemed natural and obvious, is not to be insisted upon—anyhow, not in that sense—in days when it has become incredible. Of course, of this particular item of the ancient creed it may be said that it is a detail of minor importance, and of no moral significance; but still the action taken suffices to establish the principle that the *Ecclesia Docens* is also, when it is in its right mind, the *Ecclesia Discens*; and it is a satisfaction to be able by an illustration to show that this is true even of the great and venerable Church of Rome, of which it is commonly said that she learns nothing and unlearns nothing, and that her strength lies in her fidelity to her boast that she never changes. In this particular instance it is clear that her strength has lain in her willingness to make a change. And it will be a misfortune for the Church of England if in the days to come it shall be found that a majority of those who have to recast her formularies are even more afraid of re-statement than ecclesiastics of the Church of Rome.

So much, then, in brief as to what re-statement

is. And next, since I am personally a stranger to nearly all those whom I am addressing, it may, I hope, be permitted me to make an explanation why re-statement specially interests me, why I have come to recognise its necessity, and why in my judgment it is in the Church of England and not in the Church of Rome that freedom for adequate re-statement is to be found. This explanation I can best give in a short chapter of autobiography, which shall take the form of a narrative in the third person, after the example of my former master, Cardinal Newman, who for his Anglican biographer wrote such an account of his early years.

In the year 1867 there went into residence at Oxford a well-meaning undergraduate, eighteen years of age, who in regard to religious matters found himself drawn in three different directions. Over an early but not very pronounced evangelical training had been cast the powerful influence of an elder brother, who had adopted High Church principles and practices at Cambridge, while an early love for astronomy and geology, and for physical science generally, had shown this ingenuous youth that the current orthodox conceptions of the Christian faith, at any rate in regard to the topography of heaven and hell, and in regard to supernatural occurrences generally, were not easily reconcilable with current scientific knowledge. In fact, his mind was drifting rapidly in the direction of scepticism, while his heart clung tenaciously to the theological beliefs of his childhood. Through the influence of the brother above mentioned, he was in the first half-year of his residence at Oxford brought to know, and soon to know intimately, a number of Oxford High Churchmen, from whom he learned that there exists a kind of ecclesiastical

machinery for keeping a sceptical mind under proper control. Among these guiding friends were the pious and affectionate but cloudy-minded Dr. Pusey, whose singularly uninforming Hebrew lectures he attended; and two other admirable men. H. P. Liddon and William Bright, whose vigour and earnestness, lightened by occasional flashes of humour, he has never ceased to recall with pleasure. The apparatus in question was "the authority of the Catholic Church." He found that the bishops of the early and undivided Church were infallible, whenever a large number of them were got together at the same time and place, and said the same thing. Thus instructed, he bought, with hopeful enthusiasm, a copy of Pusey's *Councils of the Church*, but was somewhat disconcerted to find how great commonly was the nugacity of the decisions to which the assembled bishops came. But it seemed right, nevertheless, to stick to the principles which he had adopted, and he began to study them afresh under the guidance of the writings of the great apostle of the Oxford Movement, the fascination of whose personality he felt long before he had ever seen him in the flesh. To cut a long story short, he felt more and more keenly the necessity of Church authority to keep the vagrant mind in order, and in 1876, after having been curate at an advanced ritualistic church in Oxford, and then, on the death of his father, rector for two or three years of a country parish in Lincolnshire, his birthplace and home, he became convinced that it was his duty to obey the principle of Church authority in what claimed to be the only "home of unity and truth," the Roman Catholic Church, wherein alone is that principle consistently followed out; and at the age of twenty-seven he was re-

ceived into that Church by Dr., afterwards Cardinal; Newman, and lived under the same roof with him, as his disciple and spiritual child, for some seven or eight years. Again, to cut short what might be told as a long story, while he learned much during that period that was to the credit of the work and influence of Roman Catholicism, he came to see also the formalism and the merely mechanical routine to which religion therein tends; and, towards the close of the period, his reading led him to recognise that, however smoothly and effectively the principle of Church authority may work, yet that it is itself based on a reading of the early history of Christianity which becomes improbable, and soon all but incredible, if the authorities are themselves studied in a critical spirit. The great and respectable tradition which makes the authority claimed by the Roman Catholic Church to flow from the Person of Jesus Christ, as its first Founder, becomes untenable and crumbles to dust when it is examined without prejudice. There can, for example, be no real certainty that the famous words, "Thou art Peter," were ever actually spoken, or, if spoken, bore the significance alleged.

With such a doubt as to the validity of the credentials of the Roman Catholic Church, submission to her authority ceases to be a duty; rather it becomes a duty publicly to renounce such submission; and so, in the autumn of 1883, the subject of my memoir withdrew from a position which had become to him a false one; and he was practically outside all organised Christian Churches for some fifteen years. But there is reason to believe that God did not forget him during that period, whether he was acting as a lecturer on ethical subjects, or as an official of the Charity Organisation Society

in Bethnal Green, or, later, as the custodian of a political club library. After having taken for some years a purely agnostic position in regard to theological beliefs, and what he believed to be an impartial, rational, and natural estimate of Jesus Christ and His religion, he came to see that these things could not so easily be disposed of, at any rate not permanently. The existence of a spiritual Power, controlling the universe and inspiring men's hearts with progressively noble emotions, became clear to him coincidentally with his realising the immense and unique importance of the Person and the life of Jesus Christ. After all that the critics had done, he found himself still face to face with this sad and solemn but still most gracious and winning Figure, in Whom he perceived that there was, at any rate for him, the fullest revelation possible of the greatness and the goodness of God. Into a spiritual experience of this kind it is not necessary or desirable to go with fuller detail; but the practical conclusion of the matter was, that it seemed now a duty to return to clerical work, in whatever Church he would be most welcome and be best able to be of service. This last consideration pointed unmistakably to the Church of England, for work in which he might be said to have an hereditary aptitude, having at least four clergymen among his ancestors. And under such circumstances, it is clear that to a man who by no means ceases to be a rational being and a critic, after again taking up clerical work, this question of theological re-statement is one of immense importance; as is also that special question proposed to be dealt with in this paper, the permanent element underlying re-statement; for, apart from this, all re-statement would be merely a trick of using words

in non-natural senses, a trick deserving condemnation as absurd as well as dishonest.

A word should be added as to wherein seems to me to lie the impossibility of this re-statement being adequately made within the Roman Catholic Church. My reference to the phrase in the "Penny Catechism," "days or periods," might suggest that it is not impossible; but that particular concession to modern knowledge is a very trifling one; and, so far as I know, the principle it involves is not allowed exercise elsewhere. There is a very small party inside the Roman Church claiming this freedom; but personally I could not accept their position (though I wish to speak with respect of those who hold this view), because the special idea of the Roman Catholic Church, one may almost say its *raison d'être*, is clearly obedience to authority. And the vigilant eye of this authority detected the tendency to rational re-statement as long as thirty years ago—more than thirty, in fact—and it was condemned by the Vatican Council, in the third section of its chapter dealing with "Faith and Reason," in these terms: "If anyone should say that, at any time, in accordance with the progress of knowledge, a sense may be given to dogmas proposed by the Church other than that which the Church understood and now understands, let him be anathema." This seems to preclude Roman Catholics from giving in any case an ideal, allegorical, or poetical significance to ancient dogmas; and the condemnation is, of course, in accordance with similar language, used by the Council of Trent, about there being in hell an everlasting, material fire, and about the authenticity of every part of the Bible contained in the Vulgate version. These things—and the list might be extended indefinitely—are insisted upon in a literal sense; and no opening seems



to be left for a re-statement, however much that may be demanded by modern knowledge. It is, in fact, undeniable that the Roman Church is as little as possible a learning church. She has been influenced, but even that grudgingly, by the growth of a humanitarian spirit in the world; and if she were again supreme, she would not punish heretics by the cruel methods of the Middle Ages—there would at any rate be no more burnings—but that whole notion of freedom of interpretation, which we of the Church of England enjoy, and which is indeed an essential part of the precious heritage of all the Reformed Churches, that is alien from her mind; and it is useless to look for it in her, at any rate within a reasonable period of time.

But what, then, is the solid underlying foundation, the existence of which, or, more correctly perhaps, our recognition of which, justifies us in giving new or broader meanings to theological formulæ, since in so doing we claim to change only what is superficial and temporary, leaving untouched the solid rock of religious truth, on which each generation builds its superstructure, in accordance with the knowledge and the temper of its times? In this connection I am glad to be able to quote two sentences from Dr. Percy Gardner's lectures, entitled *A Historic View of the New Testament*. Both in this work and in his larger and earlier work, *Exploratio Evangelica*, Dr. Gardner seems to me to take up just the position that our Churchmen's Union is bound to take in regard to the relations between ancient religion and modern thought; though as to details we may each of us find occasion to differ, and to prefer other explanations and other methods of re-statement, at any rate here and there. The first paragraph that I quote from him is as follows:—

“Religion is at bottom a condition of heart and will—a constantly maintained relation towards a higher spiritual Power. And this religion—the religion of experience and of conduct—is not immediately dependent upon our historic outlook. It is a matter, not of inference, not of learned research, but of daily life and habit of soul. We need have but little fear that any views as to historic methods can invalidate our religious, our Christian experience. They have no power to destroy facts; they can only make invalid certain inferences from experience. The great main truths of personal religion seem to me to stand before us like white mountain ranges which we may measure and geologically examine, but which we cannot dream of moving.”

This figure of a snow-clad mountain is evidently a favourite one with Dr. Gardner, for he uses it again in the second paragraph that I quote.

After stating his view as to the predominance of the will and the active powers of the soul over thought, he proceeds—

“Beyond all these wills of myself and others, there is a greater Power than ours, a Force, which in magnitude, in wisdom, and in love [I correct here what seems to be a misprint] passes our utmost thought and imagination, which lies behind the facts of external nature, which lies behind the activities and purposes of our fellow-creatures, which lies at the roots of our own being. To realise this Power in thought is the great end of religious philosophy and of theological system. To attain to some communion with this Power in exalted feeling and passionate adoration is the highest object of religious passion and enthusiasm. To become a fellow-worker with this Power in the

visible world is the practical purpose of religious organisation and ethics. This Power is the white mountain-top towards which all the upward paths of religion lead, though they can never actually reach it. And, according to the manner of their approach to it, various religions take varied forms, living by that which they are able to apprehend."

These two paragraphs contain the substance of all that need be said as to what is the "permanent element in re-statement"; and I might very well break off at this point, and leave it to the discussion which will follow to bring out details of interest and importance. But with regard to our own position at the present time, I should like to offer a few reflections before I conclude, having chiefly in view the practical aspect of the subject as it affects us clergymen in our teaching.

In the phrase of Amiel, the work of our epoch is "the transference of Christianity from history to psychology." That is a fine thought; and the more we realise that we are bound to transfer such infallibility as we recognise in religion from the region of external authority to the region of interior consciousness, the more we perceive its truth and its necessity. We do not allow the truth of our religion to depend on the provability of any historic detail.

But yet it is clear that there is no occasion for us in our teaching to be in any hurry about this transference from history to psychology. As a matter of history, Christianity is really stronger now than it was fifty years ago. No one now really doubts that the Founder of our religion actually lived and taught and died. Nor can anyone doubt that a belief in a Christ alive after His death, and spiritually present with those who looked to Him as their Master, inspired St. Paul and St. John

and the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews, whose writings exist as undeniably as does the Bank of England. There is therefore no pressing need for us to "clean our slates" of history, and to take refuge at once in psychology. And if this be so, a wide field is open for us to work on lines similar to those indicated by Albrecht Ritschl, whose disciple I must not profess to be, since I do not understand a great part of his teaching, but whose main idea (of our recognition of the value for us of the life and teaching of Christ, and of our consequent surrender of ourselves to Him, as His children, and as members of His Church) seems to me most just and true and reasonable, and an idea calculated to win the allegiance of thousands of honest and intelligent men, who distrust and dread the technicalities of theology, and shrink from that conception of a wonder-worker, which ages not so long past applied largely, though not indeed exclusively, to Christ. Friendship with God through Christ, and especially a growth in such friendship—that seems to me the element of the Ritschlian theology which can be set before people now, almost with the vividness of a new revelation; for it is the simple truth to say that since the publication of *Ecce Homo* we have been in a position to acquire a notion of the Person of Christ as a social Reformer, a spiritual Teacher, a Friend of the outcast, and in these and in other aspects Divine as well as human; a conception of Him that is as much nobler and broader than were earlier ideas, as a portrait of Christ by a modern realistic artist is superior to the representation, stern and cold and soulless, given in a Byzantine icon.

But if I do not want to be called a "Ritschlian," when I bear testimony to what I believe to be the

most true and serviceable element in the teaching, of Ritschl, neither do I want to be called a "mystic," when I add that it is only by the direct contact of spirit with Spirit that the permanent element, this foundation of personal religion, the religion of experience and of conduct, can be well and truly laid. It is a pity to affix labels, especially when those labels would imply a great deal more than is just. So I will do no more now than give it merely as my opinion, that in regard to "the permanent element in re-statement," there is quite as much to be learned from the mystics as there is from the Ritschlians—from the preaching and practising mystics, I mean; from men who have a sword and a trowel in their hands, while their hearts are in tune with the infinite; and not from mystics as mere dreamers, for whom, indeed, there seems to be no useful place in this busy, workaday world.

But it may be asked, how far re-statement is really necessary at all, and how can it best be suggested and recommended, when the need for it has become evident? The necessity for it seems to be entirely a personal matter, and to rest with each individual, differing in each case; while the great mass of those with whom we are brought into contact are quite unconscious of any such need, and will probably remain so until the end of their days. And it is surely undesirable to set before such persons any such notion as a thing that concerns themselves, but only to set it before them as a matter of Christian charity, that they should not quarrel with those who do feel the need of liberal re-statements, and avail themselves of that liberty in this respect which our Church of England, by its action at the Reformation, and by its disclaimer of infallibility, undoubtedly does

provide. It is especially undesirable to lay before a mixed audience any re-statement of long-cherished beliefs, except in some case where the re-statement will almost certainly be accepted as spiritually enlightening. And it is by no means clear that the psychological moment has arrived for this, save in regard to certain results of biblical criticism, which people generally do seem prepared to accept. As an illustration of a re-statement being made just at the right moment, I know of nothing more to the purpose than the introduction of the "Order of the Communion," in 1548. England owed it to the wisdom of the Protector Somerset that in that year there was inserted into the Latin Mass, which in other respects remained just as before, with its vestments, its lights, its secret utterance, its genuflections, and its sacring bell, all that part of the communion service which is still so refreshing in its scriptural simplicity and its devout humility, even though frequent use has perhaps made us less sensible of its beauty. But it must indeed have been an inspiring re-statement of the traditional idea of the Mass, when the priest, after he had himself communicated, turned round to the people and began in the English language, "Dearly beloved in the Lord," "Ye that do truly and earnestly repent," together with the confession and absolution, the "Comfortable Words," and the Prayer of Humble Access, and gave to the people the communion in both kinds, with the words of administration in English. What a revelation it must have been of the soul-stirring truths that had all along lain behind the Byzantine formalism of the Mass! Probably more than anything else it made possible the restoration of the Prayer-Book by Elizabeth; for we may be sure that these English

interpolations in the service were much missed by the devout during the reign of Mary. It may be doubted whether any similarly inspiring re-statement is possible now. Probably no more can be done than to claim from those who themselves perceive no need for re-statement, that they shall respect the liberty of those who do. To some extent it may be illuminating to point out that, although the word "re-statement" is somewhat novel in this connection, and the idea of it, as a deliberate and definite thing, is to many good people distasteful, yet that unconsciously it has always existed, that the change in the meaning of words itself necessitates it, and that our forefathers, who had wholly different and erroneous ideas as to the position of the globe in the universe, could not possibly have stated some details of their faith save in language that demands revision. But, frankly, I do not see how anything of this kind can inspire enthusiasm. It would be reassuring to a small minority of that vast number of men who never dream of entering a church or of hearing a sermon, a minority that really desires to remain in "the blessed company of all faithful people," and yet can look for little or no help from what they know they would hear ordinarily in church or chapel. But to the mass of churchgoers it would be almost meaningless; or, if its meaning were recognised, it would be unsettling and alarming, so almost universal has become the reliance on the little things of religion. In practice, then, it seems to come to this, that we must insist on the importance of the permanent element, and leave re-statement to take care of itself; or, anyhow, refer to it only in *obiter dicta*, which will be understood by the few and be ignored by the many. It will come when it is

wanted, while it courts for nothing if it is offered where it is not wanted. And a disciple of St. Paul, whose doctrine was certainly a re-statement of the traditions current in his time, has no need to hunt about for subject-matter on which to enlarge, confining himself strictly to that which will never require re-statement. Our people will keep to their religious duties in good faith—and who can desire more?—if only we set before them persistently “whatsoever things are true, whatsoever things are honest, whatsoever things are just, whatsoever things are pure, whatsoever things are lovely, whatsoever things are of good report.”



## CARDINAL NEWMAN, HIS WEAKNESS AND HIS STRENGTH

BEFORE I proceed to the actual subject of my lecture, it will be as well if I say just a word as to my right to speak on it at all. It is this, that I knew Cardinal Newman very well, and that for about seven years, from 1876 until 1883, I lived under the same roof with him, as a member of his community at the Birmingham Oratory. If, then, you should ask how I came to be there, and, having been there, how I have now come to be here, the questions take a little longer answering; but it is right that I should answer them, if I am to look for your attention when I deal with the significance of Newman's career.

We live in days when the forces at work to disintegrate the old religious beliefs are very strong. The scientific conception of the universe, which is undoubtedly the true one, is incompatible with that conception of the universe and of man's place in it which comes from an acceptance of the early Bible narratives as literally true. And literary criticism of the Bible has shown us that on other grounds we should be taking the wrong road if we did so accept them. And further, the comparative study of religions, especially of the Eastern religions, has shown us that there is a process by which a whole fabric of beliefs, of devotional observances, and of ecclesiastical organisation, may be

built up on lines not very different from those which we trace in the life and history of the Christian Church. And the cumulative force of arguments such as these is undoubtedly strong in the direction of scepticism. Men are led by such arguments to question whether they have hitherto been right in regarding their own religion as exclusively the true religion; and when they have reached this stage, it does not take much to detach them from its practices and its beliefs, though they may for some long time remain ostensibly in the position which they had previously held.

Now, this is no new thing, although it may be better understood now than formerly. But it was felt acutely by some of us at least thirty years ago; and I mention that time because it was then that I felt it acutely myself, shortly after I had been ordained in the Church of England. I had been associated at Oxford with the High Church party, who maintained that the remedy was to be found in the authority of the Church, which made religion secure, whatever science or criticism might say or do. This principle I accepted; but the more I examined the working of it, the more convinced I became that only by the Roman Catholic Church is the principle of authority frankly and consistently maintained. It was chiefly from Newman's writings that I learnt this; and so it was to Newman that I went when it seemed to me my duty to carry out in practice the conclusions to which I had come, as to the necessity for Church authority, and the place where alone that authority is to be found. Seven years later my reading convinced me that the claims of the Roman Catholic Church to possess this authority are not historically sound; and so I withdrew

from the position I had held, and rightly held, so long as I believed that the legitimate seat of authority was in the Roman Catholic Church. A good many years elapsed before I resumed clerical work, and I was occupied during this time with writing, reading, and lecturing; but about the year 1898 I came to realise that religious certitude lies in the direct relation between the soul and God, and that the authority both of Church and Bible may be left to take a secondary place, as being useful but not really essential to the spiritual life. Having on this basis secured a conviction of the truth of Christian doctrine in its main outlines, it seemed to me my duty to resume work in the Church of England, in which I was originally ordained, and with which, in that freer interpretation of its system which you enjoy here, I felt myself in sympathy. That is how I come to be where I am now; and I offer you this brief explanation of my position as an introduction to what I have now to say about Cardinal Newman.

Born in 1801, and dying in 1890, his life was practically conterminous with the nineteenth century; and it is true to say of him that he was the most distinguished and influential ecclesiastic of that century. What was the source of that influence, and whether it is desirable that it should be further extended, are points which I hope will become clearer as we proceed. His father was a London banker, and John Henry Newman, the eldest son, was himself born in the City, in the parish of St. Benet Fink, the church of which has since been pulled down. Newman was always proud and pleased to think of himself as an Englishman; but his family appears to be one that had emigrated from Holland a few generations earlier, and it was

probably also of Jewish extraction. His mother, whose maiden name was Fourdrinier, was of a Huguenot family, long established in London as engravers and paper manufacturers. The second son, Charles Robert, was a man of ability, but of impracticable temper, a professed atheist and a recluse. He died in 1884. The third and youngest son, Francis William, who died in 1897, was a devout theist, though a keen critic of orthodox Christianity. He was an excellent scholar, and was for many years Professor of Latin in University College, London. He took views on various questions which were regarded by most people as fads, and were, anyhow, in advance of the times. Thus he was a vegetarian, a teetotaler, an advocate of phonetic spelling, and an opponent of vaccination and of vivisection. Two of Newman's sisters married brothers, John and Thomas Mozley, Oxford men and clergymen, and one or two of their children survive, and are the sole representatives of the family. No member of it ever followed him into the Church of Rome.

He was educated at a private school at Ealing, where he made good progress in his studies, but was also distinguished by a certain shyness and aloofness, taking no part in the school games. He was superstitious in these early years, and used to make the sign of the cross on going into the dark, a singular thing for a boy to do who had been brought up in the evangelical religion of his home. At the age of fifteen he was "converted," in the evangelical sense of the term; and this throughout his subsequent life of seventy-five years he never ceased to believe in, as having brought his soul into direct personal relations with God, and so to have saved him from atheism or agnosticism. To understand him aright, it is important to bear this incident

in mind; for the natural bent of his intellect was certainly towards scepticism. It is a doctrine of the Roman Catholic Church that the existence of God can be proved for certain by rational arguments. Newman never fully accepted this, though he was bound to assent to it. In his judgment man knows God—or, more correctly, men know God, for not all men do so know Him—by intuition, and they cannot know Him without it; so that a man who is not blessed with this interior light, which gives joy and peace to the soul, has, according to Newman, no choice but to remain an agnostic until that light has been vouchsafed to him. So again, in Tract LXXXV., which Newman wrote about the year 1839, he insisted on the enormous difficulties that lie in the way of proving the credibility of the Christian Creed and the books of Holy Scripture. He seems to be arguing for unbelief; but his own certitude concerning God and revelation, due to this conversion in his youth, had by this time led him to hold with equal certitude the existence of an authoritative Church, which infallibly guarantees the truth of the Creed and the Bible. So that the difficulties he was raising had no terrors for himself—he was beyond their reach—but for others without his religious experience they were a danger to faith; and his attitude in this matter was one of the reasons why, as a theologian, he was never altogether trusted or regarded as sound by the authorities within the Roman Catholic Church.

He was an Anglican clergyman for twenty years after 1824, and at first he was what we should now call a Low Churchman. He helped to start the *Record* newspaper, he supported the Church Missionary Society and the Bible Society; and it is hardly necessary to say that, as he quitted the Church of

England in 1845, he was never what we should now call a "Ritualist": he wore the customary long surplice with hood and black scarf and bands; he preached in a black gown, and stood at the north end of the Lord's table. But after he had been in orders about three years, his views began to assume a more ecclesiastical tone, especially in regard to what is called the "apostolic succession," which he came to associate exclusively with ordination by a bishop; and in the year 1830, after an unsuccessful attempt to exclude Nonconformists from participating in the management of the Church Missionary Society, he was dismissed from the post of local secretary of that Society in Oxford. In December 1832, accompanying a friend who was recommended a voyage in the Mediterranean for the benefit of his health, he visited Malta, Gibraltar, and the Ionian Islands, and subsequently Sicily, Naples, and Rome, where he was introduced to Dr. (afterwards Cardinal) Wiseman. Rome he described as "the most wonderful place on earth," but at this date the Roman Catholic religion still seemed to him "polytheistic, degrading, and idolatrous." During this voyage he wrote many of those short poems afterwards printed in the *Lyra Apostolica*, the best known of them being the verses beginning, "Lead, kindly Light, amidst the encircling gloom," which have become very popular as a hymn. As a poet, Newman had undoubtedly inspiration and power. Some of these short and earlier poems have been described by the late Mr. Richard Holt Hutton, who for many years edited the *Spectator*, as "unequalled for grandeur of outline, purity of taste, and radiance of total effect"; and his latest and longest poem, the well-known *Dream of Gerontius*, is generally recognised as the happiest effort to

represent the unseen world that has been made since the days of Dante. It must be admitted, however, that there is another side to some of these short poems, as was pointed out to me some years ago by Mr. Gladstone. There is an element of hardness and narrowness about them; they breathe, some few of them at least, a fierce, intolerant spirit. I have in my mind now especially the verses addressed to France, and entitled "Apostasy," which contain the words—

"I dare not think of thee as what thou art,  
Lest thoughts too deep for man should trouble me, . . .  
And so in silence I will now proclaim  
Hate of thy present self, and scarce will sound thy name."

And the verses addressed to the theological liberals of his day—

"Ye cannot halve the gospel of God's grace;  
Men of presumptuous heart, I know you well."

But a gentler spirit breathes in the poem entitled "The Good Samaritan," which begins with the words—

"O that thy creed were sound,  
For thou dost soothe the heart, thou Church of Rome."

And he had good reason to speak thus in terms of gratitude; for he was taken dangerously ill with a fever, when out for a lonely walk near a small town in Sicily, and was very near death; indeed, he would have died but for the kindly attention of some Roman Catholic natives, with whom he could not converse; and, it may be added, but for a strong conviction in his own mind that he was bound to recover, because he had a work to do in England.

It was in the summer of 1833, shortly after his

return from this foreign tour, that the Oxford or Tractarian Movement was inaugurated by a sermon preached in St. Mary's Church by Mr. Keble, whose book of religious poetry, *The Christian Year*, had been published six years previously. Newman's uncompromising zeal soon placed him at the head of the movement; and the idea of the "Tracts" seems to have been his own exclusively. He himself wrote twenty-four out of the total number of ninety. I should perhaps explain that these Oxford "Tracts" (whence the movement derived the name of "Tractarian") were not what is now commonly understood by the term. Some of them, the early ones especially, were not indeed very long, but they were all learned theological treatises; and some of the later ones, if published in book form, would have made volumes of considerable size. They were mostly addressed to the clergy, and their aim was to establish Church principles, and that mainly on historical grounds. As time went on, the ideas of the writers became more "advanced," as the phrase is, and sober-minded people began to be apprehensive as to what it would all lead to. There was a growing approximation to the doctrines of the Roman Catholic Church; and the Protestantism of the Church of England, which until then no one had questioned, seemed to be in danger. The alarm reached a climax when, in 1841, appeared Tract XC., which was an examination of the Thirty-nine Articles of the Church of England, with the object of showing that they were not directed against the authorised creed of Roman Catholics, but merely against popular errors and exaggerations; the implication being that a person who had signed the Articles (and all members of the University had to do this) were none the less free to believe



all that Roman Catholics are bound to believe. Four senior tutors, among them Archibald Campbell Tait, who was afterwards Archbishop of Canterbury, indignantly denounced the Tract as "suggesting and opening a way by which men might violate their solemn engagements to the University." Newman bowed before the storm, discontinued the publication of the Tracts, and the year following withdrew from Oxford to Littlemore, about three miles distant, where he lived in a kind of monastic seclusion with a small band of followers, until, three years later, they were received into the Roman Catholic Church. It would take me too long to criticise with any fulness Newman's action in this matter. But this I can say: I believe Tract XC. to be an unsuccessful, or, if you like, a dishonest attempt to evade the true meaning of the Articles; but I do not think that Newman was personally dishonest in making it; and in a wholly unexpected way his attempt has had a happy result. No age has the right to impose its views upon succeeding ages; and Newman in Tract XC. showed that the attempt to do so almost necessarily fails, because, if men resent the imposition, and are resolved to be free from it, somehow or other they will shake themselves loose, however determined the process of binding may have been. No one who reads the history of the Church of England in the days of Elizabeth can doubt that the Articles were agreed upon in a thoroughly Protestant sense; and yet, three hundred years later, it was more or less proved that they are capable of a Catholic interpretation. Newman felt bound to attempt to give them such an interpretation, because his acceptance of the principle of the authority of the ancient Church had led him to believe the whole cycle of ancient

Catholic doctrine. He could not well have done other than he did. His mind was in 1841 not yet ripe for submission to the Roman Catholic Church, as it was in 1845, when he made his submission; and so at the earlier date he made a struggle to maintain what later he saw was an untenable position. He was, in my judgment at least, mistaken, but not dishonest. And indirectly his struggle secured liberty for the members of the Church of England generally, and especially for those liberal members of it whom he instinctively regarded as his chief opponents. It is largely due to Tract XC. that subscription to the Articles is almost obsolete in our Universities, and that in 1865 an Act of Parliament was passed, modifying the sense of such subscription in all cases, and making it to consist in a general assent to the doctrine and system of the Church of England, and not to a number of precisely worded dogmas. We may be thankful to Newman for this.

He has been severely blamed for his submission to the Church of Rome; and certainly by the example he set in this respect he helped to withdraw from the Church of England, especially in the period of from 1845 to 1851, a large number of her most devoted clergy, some hundreds in all, the name of Archdeacon, afterwards Cardinal, Manning being perhaps the most notable among those whom he thus influenced. But we must not forget that what he did was a striking testimony to the supremacy of conscience; and it is better that the Church of England should be weakened by secessions than that the claims of conscience should be set aside. It may be true that his conscience and the consciences of those who followed him were ill-instructed, and so allowed them to go astray. It may be true that with wider knowledge and broader Christian prin-

ciples they would have seen things differently, and would have remained to work in what seems to us "a more excellent way"; but the fact remains that, seeing things as they did see them, Newman and his disciples were bound in conscience to take the step that they did; and that their abandonment in many cases of positions of comfort and dignity is a thing of which we may all feel in some sense proud; for all true religion and morality is based on the duty of obedience to conscience.

Newman's own eloquent testimony should be quoted in this connection. In his letter to the Duke of Norfolk, written at the close of the year 1874, as a protest against Mr. Gladstone's denunciations of the Vatican Council, he included a section of sixteen pages on conscience, from which I take the following sentences:—

"Conscience is not a long-sighted selfishness, nor a desire to be consistent with one's self, but it is a messenger from Him Who both in nature and in grace speaks to us behind a veil, and teaches and rules us by His representatives. Conscience is the aboriginal Vicar of Christ, a prophet in its informations, a monarch in its peremptoriness, a priest in its blessings and anathemas; and even though the eternal priesthood throughout the Church could cease to be, in it the sacramental principle would remain, and would have a sway." And he concluded the section as follows: "If I am obliged to bring religion into after-dinner toasts (which indeed does not seem quite the thing), I shall drink to the Pope, if you please—still, to Conscience first, and to the Pope afterwards."

But I should quickly occupy all the time at my disposal if I were to indulge in quotations from Newman's writings, so full they are of eloquent

passages, singularly lucid and forcible, with flashes of irony and of humour, which make even dull topics to appear interesting. And this is especially true of those writings which date after his joining the Roman Catholic Church. One of the attractive things about Newman was his versatility. I have spoken of him as a poet; but he was also a philosopher, a theologian, a historian, a critic, and a musician; while his gifts would have qualified him as a first-rate journalist, had his career taken that turn. And, speaking in this place, I must add that he had in a marked degree many of those characteristics which go to make a saint; though a certain imperiousness and implacability of temper, and an intense belief in himself and in the importance of his work, may be mentioned as inconsistent with the saintly ideal. But it would be certainly true to say of him that he lived all his life consciously in the presence of God.

It is as a controversial writer and as a preacher that Newman has had the greatest influence. As preacher, or better, as the reader of his written sermons, with sweet, persuasive, sympathetic voice; for he had no gifts as an orator, and at no time in his life could he make an unwritten speech. As controversialist he has the charm of apparent candour. He does not understate the charge that he has to disprove, rather he seems anxious to state it just as his opponent would; and then he meets it by urging considerations, such as everyone must admit to be fair and reasonable, until the original charge seems almost to refute itself by its comparative coarseness and extravagance. Within the Roman Church his influence has not been very great. No doubt, for that Church he obtained, by his submission to it, great prestige and

the dissipation of many ill-founded prejudices. But, apart from individual followers, there is no evidence that his influence within it (which was in the direction of a broader and more tolerant spirit, and a recognition of the important part played by development both in doctrine and in church government), there is no evidence that his influence has been either wide or deep. Within the Anglican Church, and even within the more strictly Protestant Churches his influence has been greater; but here it has been in the direction of insisting on the necessity of dogma, and on the indispensableness of the severer, chastened, and ascetic side of the Christian religion. And this is a matter of grave importance. We are in danger in these days of taking religion to mean little else than bright and cheerful services, pleasant Sunday afternoons, clubs and institutes, entertainments and tea-meetings, with just a sprinkling of "straight talks" and Bible classes. Even God Himself, in much of the easy-going religion of the day, is made to figure as a kind of immense Father Christmas, with plenty of gifts for everyone, but hardly a word to say about sin or holiness. This may do well enough when the days go smoothly, and there are no great troubles, no severe temptations, to harass us. But religion, to be of any permanent use, must be more than that. It must be able to sustain us in times of trial, or of spiritual desolation, in the hour of death, and in the day of judgment. And it is the austere and solemn side of our religion, a side that cannot fail to be recognised by all who honestly study the life of Christ and the lives of His faithful followers, it is this that alone can supply what we need in such hours as those. Newman has done us all a service in helping us to realise this fact.

And if we are not disposed to follow him when he goes on to teach that only within the fold of the Roman Catholic Church are we sure to find grace for our souls, that is in the long run because we doubt the thoroughness of his knowledge of the history of the Christian Church, and because we suspect that his judgment herein is not without bias. In point of fact, he was not a well-read man in those departments of study which have so revolutionised our ideas as to the position of man in the universe and as to the religious history of mankind. With the scientific and critical literature published between the years 1850 and 1890 he was barely so much as acquainted; and he knew no German—a fact which accounts for much.

He was a man of magnetic personality. People were strangely drawn into the circle of his influence; while some of those who broke with him—and there were many who did break with him—felt towards him subsequently something that almost amounted to repulsion, even while they still recognised his great and good qualities. His character may perhaps be best described as feminine, both in its strength and in its weakness. He was extremely affectionate towards individuals, and he longed for affection in return; but if he once came to doubt a man's loyalty towards himself, that man soon discovered that Newman could also be what Dr. Johnson calls "a good hater." He was, in fact, too sensitive and self-conscious to be a successful organiser and leader of men, and too impetuous, too easily crushed by some slight rebuff, to take any useful part in public affairs. It has been said that had he remained in the Church of England he would certainly have been a bishop, perhaps Archbishop of Canterbury; but he had none of

the qualifications that go to make a successful administrator or ruler, and he was certainly far happier in the seclusion of Edgbaston than he would have been at Lambeth or at Westminster before the eyes of men. It was an immense gratification to him to be made a Cardinal in 1879 ; but, in his case, the dignity was an almost purely honorary one, and involved no public duties whatever.

As Cardinal he adopted a motto, *Cor ad cor loquitur*, "Heart speaketh to heart"; and for his memorial tablet at Edgbaston he selected another, *Ex umbris et imaginibus in veritatem*, "From shadows and figures to the truth," as indicative of the course taken by a departing soul. And these two sentences perhaps reveal to us as much as will ever be known of the secret of a life, which, both to his contemporaries and to later students, has been one of almost fascinating interest, at once devout and inquiring, affectionate and yet sternly self-restrained.

I should be glad to think that I have succeeded in setting before you a just and intelligible likeness of one who has most profoundly influenced my own life, as well as the lives of many who are well known and dear to me ; one whom I shall never cease to regard with a peculiar sentiment of affection and veneration, coupled with a sense of regret, and partly also of distrust ; one whom all, I think, must acknowledge to have been, whatever were his limitations, a servant of God and a devout and sincere disciple of Jesus Christ our Lord.

## STATEMENT PREFATORY TO DECLARATION OF ASSENT

It is my duty this morning, in place of a sermon, to read to you the Thirty-nine Articles, and then to make the prescribed Declaration of Assent to them and to the Book of Common Prayer. But before I do this, I think it is due both to myself and to you to say a few words in explanation of what this Declaration of Assent implies. For unless this is done, there is some danger lest a conclusion as to its significance should be drawn, unfavourable to that comprehensiveness which is one of the legitimate glories of the Church of England. Indeed, I could not make the Declaration if I believed that thereby I was narrowing the field either for myself or for others. I will therefore briefly explain in what sense I understand it.

The Articles were drawn up at the time of the Reformation, that is, about three hundred and forty years ago. It was a period of bitter controversy, and the natural tendency was for the parties on either side to state their beliefs in such a manner as to make the most of those points whereon they differed. But, on the whole, our Church of England took a moderate line; and though the Articles are here and there disfigured by contemptuous controversial phrases, this fault is in them much less apparent than in other Protestant Confessions of Faith. But besides being a period of controversy,



it was also a period of comparative unenlightenment. That is to say, much that is known now was not known then, both as to the history of mankind on this earth and the position of the earth itself in the universe, and also as to the origin and history of the books of the Bible, and the history of religion generally. That being so, our Reformers in the sixteenth century expressed some of their beliefs in language that would not be used if the Articles were now being compiled for the first time. Their beliefs were true in so far as they were spiritual beliefs, for such is the permanence of "the faith once for all delivered to the saints"; but their expression of them was necessarily faulty, in consequence of the limitations of the times. Already, by what they had done in rejecting many venerable traditions, and in making use of what was then the "new learning" about the Bible, they had shown that the Reformed Church of England was to be progressive in its liberty and power to re-state the old beliefs in such a way as to bring them into harmony with the knowledge of the day; and they did not pretend to legislate for all future generations. They would indeed have stultified themselves had they claimed any such infallibility.

The new learning of the nineteenth century brought these facts into prominence; and about fifty years ago a number of excellent clergymen and laymen, devout members of the Church of England, complained that the Articles were no longer well suited to the times; and they demanded that no one should be called upon to subscribe to them in such sense as to imply that he accepted every phrase, constituting in all some hundreds of dogmatic propositions, precisely in the sense in which they were understood in the sixteenth century. The reason-

ableness of this demand was generally admitted; and in 1865 what is called the "Subscription Relief Act" was passed, prescribing a merely general Declaration, which is that now made. The special point in this modified Declaration was the substitution—by the advice, I believe, of the late Dean Stanley—of the word "doctrine," in the singular, for the word "doctrines," in the plural, as previously used. "The doctrine of the Church of England," to which I shall presently make my assent, means that moderate and reasonable interpretation of the articles of the Christian faith which is in accordance with the principles of morality implanted in mankind by God Himself, and which is also in accordance with the settled conclusions of sound and reverent learning, both scientific and literary. And the Declaration includes an acceptance of the system of the Church of England as it has been handed down to us, and as we find it at work. It does not mean that that system is incapable of improvement. On the contrary, as members of a Reformed Church, we assert and retain our liberty constantly to aim at its improvement, in accordance with the needs of the times.

When, therefore, I make this Declaration, you will understand me to mean that I believe the system and doctrine of the Church of England, in which I was myself born and educated, to be as a whole those best adapted to bring home to myself and to others that knowledge of God as revealed in Jesus Christ which is necessary for our salvation; and also that I solemnly undertake, as rector of these united parishes, to make use of that system, as laid down in the Prayer-Book, to the best of my ability, in such ways as shall seem most calculated to promote the glory of God and the spiritual welfare of those to whom I minister.

THEOLOGY LIBRARY  
CLAREMONT, CALIF.

A25640

*Printed by*  
MORRISON & GIBB LIMITED,  
*Edinburgh*

## BY THE SAME AUTHOR.

---

**OUR POSITION AS CATHOLICS IN THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND.** Oxford: Rivingtons, 1872. Price 1s.  
[*Out of print.*]

**THE ANGLICAN MINISTRY: Its Nature and Value in relation to the Catholic Priesthood.** With a Preface by Cardinal NEWMAN. London: Kegan Paul, 1879. Price 14s.  
[*Out of print.*]

**PERSONAL RECOLLECTIONS OF CARDINAL NEWMAN.** Articles in the "Expositor," September, October, and November 1890.

**CARDINAL MANNING.** London: Methuen. First Edition (with Bibliography), 1892. Price 6s. [*Out of print.*] Second Edition (in the Series, "English Leaders in Religion") 1893. Price 3s. 6d.

**INTRODUCTION TO MAITLAND'S "ESSAYS ON THE REFORMATION."** London: John Lane, 1899, Price 6s.

**THE INNER WAY.** Sermons by JOHN TAULER. Edited, with an Introduction. London: Methuen, 1900 (in the "Library of Devotion"). Price 2s. 6d.

**INTRODUCTION AND APPENDIX TO REPRINT OF NEWMAN'S "LIVES OF THE ENGLISH SAINTS."** London: Freemantle, 1901-1902. Six Vols. Price 6s. each.

**Articles on POPE LEO XIII. and on Cardinals MANNING, NEWMAN, and WISEMAN,** in the Supplemental Volumes of the "Encyclopædia Britannica."

**M**R. FRANCIS GRIFFITHS begs to announce that he has taken over the publishing arrangements of *THE BIBLICAL ILLUSTRATOR* and *THE MEN OF THE BIBLE*, and that all the Volumes in these two important series of books will in future be published by him at the above address at the prices quoted in this Catalogue.

For the last thirty years the Editor of *The Biblical Illustrator* has diligently collected Sermons, Sermon Outlines, and Homiletic and Illustrative material of every description. He has also been assisted by experienced Readers working in the British Museum and other large public Libraries. Thousands of rare and costly books, magazines, and newspapers, now out of print, have been searched and their best thoughts embodied in *The Biblical Illustrator*. The work is, in fact, a great Critical, Homiletic, Anecdotal, and Illustrative Commentary on almost every verse of Holy Scripture, and shows at a glance how the great Preachers of the Ages have dealt with the topics on which they have preached. These Volumes will be found most helpful in preparing for Bible Class Lessons, Children's Services, and Pulpit Work. They constitute in themselves a library of great value.

*The Biblical Illustrator* will still be edited by the Rev. J. S. EXELL, M.A., who, assisted by a small army of Students, has given years of patient and careful study and research to the preparation of this *Commentary of Commentaries*, which gives in brief the contents of thousands of volumes. *The Biblical Illustrator* is the most useful and popular work consulted by Preachers, and is the best Expository, Sermonic, and Illustrative Bible for busy Pastors, Workers, and Teachers.

# The Biblical Illustrator.

By the Rev. J. S. EXELL, M.A.

---

## PRESS OPINIONS OF "THE BIBLICAL ILLUSTRATOR."

"It may safely be said that this work stands alone for its extraordinary amount and variety of homiletic material. For preachers and teachers in want of suggestion, the 'Illustrator' has peculiar value; and we have reason to know that it is held in high esteem alike in the old and the new worlds."—*The Christian*.

"This commentary forms a valuable edition to our biblical literature. . . . The best thoughts of our best divines. . . . Thoroughly Evangelical and truly Catholic. . . . Invaluable to ministers, local preachers, and Sunday School teachers."—*English Churchman*.

"The expository and illustrative matter is drawn from an immense variety of sources, and is wisely selected."—*Critical Review*.

"We cordially recommend the volumes as a complete treasury of exposition and illustration."—*Methodist Recorder*.

"These volumes will be worth more than their weight in gold to many a minister whose library is all too scantily furnished."—*Literary World*.

"Bulk almost beyond belief; quality beyond all praise."—*Expository Times*.

"Here is a whole library boiled down and put within the reach of the preacher who has any margin at all for books. As for those who never have the luxury of securing a new book, would that some rich man saw that they had every volume of Mr. Exell's 'Illustrator.'"—*Literary World*.

"More matter, perhaps, for the money than any book you ever saw; for every page contains as much as some books would spread over several pages."—*Expository Times*.

"To the clergy, and indeed to all Bible students, 'The Biblical Illustrator' is invaluable."—*Church Sunday School Magazine*.

"Of such great value to the preacher of every class. When complete there will be hardly anything to equal it in practical helpfulness; and the cheapness of the volumes is wonderful."—*Literary Churchman*.

"The student whose library is limited will find in these excellent volumes a treasury of exposition, homiletic help, and illustration hard to match—certainly unequalled at the price."—*Methodist Recorder*.

---

LONDON: FRANCIS GRIFFITHS, 34 MAIDEN LANE, STRAND, W.C.

# The Biblical Illustrator;

Or, Anecdotes, Similes, Emblems, Illustrations, and Sermon  
Outlines on the Verses of the Bible, gathered from the entire range  
of Home and Foreign Literature of the Past and Present.

By the Rev. J. S. EXELL, M.A.

*Demy 8vo, cloth. Price 7s. 6d. net, per Volume.*

The following are the Volumes now ready:—

## THE OLD TESTAMENT.

Genesis, Vol. I.—ch. i.—xvii.  
Genesis, Vol. II.—xviii.—l.  
Exodus.  
Leviticus and Numbers.  
Deuteronomy.

Joshua, Judges, and Ruth.  
I. and II. Chronicles, Ezra,  
Nehemiah, and Esther.  
Psalms, Vol. I.—Ps. i.—xxvi.  
Proverbs.

*(New Volumes in the Press.)*

## THE NEW TESTAMENT—COMPLETE (27 Vols.).

St. Matthew.  
St. Mark.  
St. Luke, Vol. I.—ch. i.—vii.  
St. Luke, Vol. II.—viii.—xiii.  
St. Luke, Vol. III.—xiv.—xxiv.  
St. John, Vol. I.—i.—vii.  
St. John, Vol. II.—viii.—xv.  
St. John, Vol. III.—xvi.—xxi  
Acts, Vol. I.—i.—viii.  
Acts, Vol. II.—ix.—xvii.  
Acts, Vol. III.—xviii.—xxviii.  
Romans, Vol. I.—i.—viii.  
Romans, Vol. II.—viii.—xvi.  
I. Corinthians, Vol. I.—i.—ix.

I. Corinthians, Vol. II.—ch. x.—xvi.  
II. Corinthians.  
Galatians.  
Ephesians.  
Philippians and Colossians.  
I. and II. Thessalonians and  
I. Timothy.  
II. Timothy, Titus, and Philemon.  
Hebrews, Vol. I.—i.—viii.  
Hebrews, Vol. II.—ix.—xiii.  
James.  
I. and II. Peter.  
I., II., and III. John, and Jude.  
Revelation.

## INDEX TO THE NEW TESTAMENT VOLUMES.

*Demy 8vo, price 10s. 6d. net.*

This Volume contains a most full and complete INDEX to all the volumes of  
**THE BIBLICAL ILLUSTRATOR** on the **NEW TESTAMENT**. To give some idea of the wealth of material in **THE BIBLICAL ILLUSTRATOR**, it is sufficient to mention that this Index contains more than 72,000 entries of subjects, and forms the most exhaustive Index of Religious, Theological, and Biblical thought ever issued from the Press. The price is **10s. 6d. net**.

LONDON: FRANCIS GRIFFITHS, 34 MAIDEN LANE, STRAND, W.C.

# Pickwickian Studies.

By PERCY FITZGERALD, M.A., F.S.A.

*Price 5s. net.*

Mr. Pickwick at Ipswich, Bath, Old Rochester. Boz and Blacking. Single Speech Trundle. Muggleton and its Cricket. Goswell Street. Mary Hogarth. The Pickwick Club. Roadside Inns. Mr. Pickwick's Prototype. The Calverley Examination Paper. Pickwick in Real Life. Pickwickian Characteristics. Pickwick at Dulwich.

A most interesting and entertaining volume.

---

## The Mystery of Shakespeare's Sonnets.

An Attempted Elucidation.

By CUMING WALTERS.

*Crown 8vo, cream cloth, gilt lettering and gilt top.*

*Price 3s. 6d. net.*

Chap. I. Who was "Mr. W. H."?—Chap. II. The Poet's Meaning and Motive.—Chap. III. The Contending Spirits, "Fair" and "Dark."—Chap. IV. Shakespeare Self-Vindicated, etc.

"Read this book from beginning to end, 'The Mystery of Shakespeare's Sonnets,' an attempted Elucidation, by Mr. Cuming Walters. It will help you, perhaps, to understand that Shakespeare was greater than either you or I. . . . Who is there at all that shall judge him? . . . Read Mr. Walters' book. He will clear your mind of the loathsome cant with which some men in the street have befogged Shakespeare for themselves. Respect the interesting elucidation Mr. Walters offers. I believe there is much truth in it. . . . Mr. Walters makes as fine a guess as may be. But whether you accept it or not, never again read into the Sonnets a loathsome meaning."—Mr. JOHN DAVIDSON, in the *Speaker*.

"A clever, scholarly, pleasing work."—*Glasgow Herald*.

---

LONDON :

FRANCIS GRIFFITHS, 34 MAIDEN LANE, STRAND, W.C.



*Seventy Years at Westminster.*

# SIR JOHN MOWBRAY'S REMINISCENCES.

With other Letters and Notes of the late Right Hon.  
Sir JOHN MOWBRAY, Bart., M.P. Edited by his  
DAUGHTER. With Portraits and other Illustrations.  
Large crown 8vo, 7s. 6d.

“Apart from its biographical interest, Miss Mowbray’s ably compiled volume is of no small value as a record of parliamentary life and manners during successive periods of the century just closed, and as a rich fund of anecdote and reminiscence relating to the political leaders and other famous men.”—*World*.

“We commend to our readers this modest and true record of a member of the old school. . . . As the book is of moderate size, and is good reading from beginning to end, it compares favourably with the prolix and pretentious biographies that are too much the fashion.”—*Literature*.

“Emphatically, Miss Mowbray has done the reading public excellent service in placing this volume before them. . . . Infinitely more agreeable and instructive reading than many more ambitious and self-conscious essays in the same line. . . . Every chapter will repay perusal.”—*Pall Mall Gazette*.

“There are some fascinating stories of bygone times in ‘Seventy Years at Westminster.’ . . . Told in simple, unaffected language, they bring vividly before us some of the most notable scenes and events in a career of much public honour and usefulness.”—*Daily Express*.

---

LONDON:

FRANCIS GRIFFITHS, 34 MAIDEN LANE, STRAND, W.C.

# A History of Rhodesia.

Compiled from Official Sources.

By HOWARD HENSMAN.

*With a Map. Crown 8vo, 6s.*

Early History of Rhodesia—Matabeleland under Lobengula—British South Africa Company—Founding a Colony—War with the Matabele—The Jameson Raid—The Jameson Raid Committee—The Matabele Rebellion—Sir Richard Martin's Inquiry—The Progress of the Country—Mr. Rhodes and the Imperial Government—Representative Government in Rhodesia, etc. etc.

“We would not forego any portion of Mr. Hensman's work. . . . It is very fair, surprisingly so, if we take the nearness of the events which he relates, and the style and the treatment are intended to be without bias. This is an extremely difficult performance, yet Mr. Hensman seems to have achieved it.”—*Spectator*.

“Mr. Hensman has set forth the short and stormy history of the colony in a clear and workmanlike fashion. His book is eminently readable and interesting. From the days of the first concession-hunters of 1888 to the heroic defence of Kimberley and of Mafeking, it presents the course of Rhodesian history in a well-knit narrative.”—*St. James's Gazette*.

“A timely book. . . . Here in a small compass is all that the reader wants to know of Rhodesia, succinctly and impartially told. . . . A praiseworthy piece of work.”—*Daily Mail*.

“As a general description of Rhodesia—historical, political, and industrial . . . deserves high commendation . . . The book contains exactly the kind of information the reading public would like to possess.”—*Daily News*.

“Everybody interested in the future of South Africa will profit by reading this book.”—*Glasgow Herald*.

---

LONDON :

FRANCIS GRIFFITHS, 34 MAIDEN LANE, STRAND, W.C.

# Lectures and Essays.

By Sir STAFFORD HENRY NORTHCOTE,  
FIRST EARL OF IDDESLEIGH.

*Demy 8vo, 6s. net.*

CONTENTS :—I. Do States, like Individuals, inevitably tend, after a Period of Maturity, to Decay?—II. On Taste.—III. Accuracy.—IV. Desultory Reading.—V. On the Study of Political Economy.—VI. Schools and School Life.—VII. On Nothing.—VIII. The Closing of the Exchequer by Charles II. in 1672.—IX. Names and Nicknames.—X. Archæology of Devon and Cornwall.—XI. On Distant Correspondence.—XII. Molière, etc. etc.

---

## Life of the Right Honourable William Henry Smith, M.P.

By Sir HERBERT MAXWELL, Bart., M.P.

*With a Portrait and other Illustrations. Price 3s. 6d.*

---

## Memoir of Edward Craven Hawtrey, D.D.,

Headmaster and afterwards Provost of Eton.

By FRANCIS ST. JOHN THACKERAY, M.A., F.S.A.

*Illustrated. Price 7s. 6d.*

---

LONDON :  
FRANCIS GRIFFITHS, 34 MAIDEN LANE, STRAND, W.C.

# Studies in Philosophy.

By the Rev. J. LIGHTFOOT, M.A., D.Sc.

*Crown 8vo, 2s. 6d. net.*

CONTENTS:—An Introduction to the Study of Philosophy, with special reference to the Problem of Kant—The Schools of Philosophy: Materialism, Agnosticism, Idealism, Christianity—Subjective Idealism: Berkeley, Kant, Fichte, Conscience—The Freedom of the Will—The Physical Basis of Life.

---

*In the Press.*

## Creed and Civilisation.

**Their Alliance in the Experience of History.**

Being Studies in Pagan Naturalism, the Founding of Christianity, and the Career of the Latin Church.

By THOMAS GORDON, M.A., B.D.

*Cloth, crown 8vo, 5s. net.*

CONTENTS:—I. Deification of Nature as the Basis of Religious and Moral Life in Asia and Africa.—II. Pagan Naturalism as Expressed by the Greek Mind.—III. The Contribution of the Roman Spirit to the Power of Religious Motive in Human Nature.—IV. The Biblical Interpretation of God.—V. The Influence of Christianity on Greek Thought and Civilisation.—VI. The Greeks' Intellectual Acceptance of the Christian Faith.—VII. The Development of Evangelical Faith in Latin Christianity.—VIII. The Dominating Power of the Christian Faith in the Dark Ages.—IX. The Christian Faith under Mediæval Sovereigns and Pontiffs.—X. Mediæval Christianity in Political, Social, and Religious Life.

---

*Just ready.*

## Jezebel: A Drama.

By P. MORDAUNT BARNARD, B.D.,

Rector of Headley, Surrey.

*Crown 8vo, cloth, 2s. net.*

---

LONDON:

FRANCIS GRIFFITHS, 34 MAIDEN LANE, STRAND, W.C.

# Denton's Commentaries.

*Demy 8vo, cloth. Five Volumes. Price 6s. net, per Volume.*

**A COMMENTARY ON THE GOSPELS** For the Sundays and other Holy Days of the Christian Year. By the Rev. W. DENTON, M.A. Three Vols. Demy 8vo, 6s. net, each Vol.

**A COMMENTARY ON THE EPISTLES** For the Sundays and other Holy Days of the Christian Year. By the Rev. W. DENTON, M.A. Two Vols. Demy 8vo, 6s. net, each Vol.

---

## OPINIONS OF THE PRESS.

“It is a very noble work; the amount of reading and of sound theology which has gone to its compilation is very large indeed, and in consulting it a clergyman is really getting the pith of the combined judgments of all the best thinkers and writers of the Church, whether ancient or modern. This is a large thing to say, but it is true. And we could wish no better training for a young clergyman than for him to spend at least one day in each week over Mr. Denton's commentary.”—*Literary Churchman*.

“Such an addition to our practical theology, that every parish priest who has sermons to prepare will be glad to have within constant reach so rich a mine of reference.”—*Literary Churchman*.

“This valuable work is now complete, and the more we examine it and use it, the more it appears to us to be a monument of sanctified learning, and of a sound and rational, though catholic piety.”—*Clerical Journal*.

“There are few writers to whom the clergy in their preparation for sermons are more indebted than the author of this commentary. We do not know any other work that covers exactly the same ground as that of Mr. Denton. . . . There is hardly any writer, whether primitive, mediæval, or modern, whom Mr. Denton has not pressed into his service. . . . A most admirable work; one which we cordially recommend to all students of theology, and to those who have to prepare homilies for the pulpit. It is a book which we heartily wish may always find a place on the list of books recommended by bishops' chaplains to candidates for Holy Orders.”—*Church Review*.

---

LONDON :

FRANCIS GRIFFITHS, 34 MAIDEN LANE, STRAND, W.C.

# English Preachers.

*Crown 8vo Volumes. Bound in red cloth, gold letters, gilt top, 3s. net, per Volume.*

A. W. HUTTON, M.A.

**ECCLESIA DISCENS. Occasional Sermons and Addresses.** By the Rev. ARTHUR WOLLASTON HUTTON, M.A., Rector of St. Mary-le-Bow, Cheap-side. Crown 8vo, cloth, 3s. net.

CONTENTS:—The Presence of the Kingdom—The Restoration of Faith—Our Father's Kingdom—Vocation to the Ministry—The Heavenly Vision—The Old Testament and its Critics—Authority and the Bible—The Significance of Anglican Ritual—The Ritschlian Theology and its Relation to Mysticism—The Permanent Element in Theological Re-Statement—Cardinal Newman: his Weakness and his Strength.

T. F. LOCKYER, B.A.

**SEEKING A COUNTRY.** Sermons by the Rev. THOMAS F. LOCKYER, B.A. Crown 8vo, cloth, 3s. net.

CONTENTS:—Seeking a Country—The Homeward Way—A Citizen of No Mean City—My Redeemer Liveth—The Last Pass-over—Idylls of Home Life—They came to Marah—Love's Faithful Waiting—Evening and Morning—The Gift of the Morning Star—Shall He Live Again—The Challenge of Eastertide—None of You asketh, Whither?—The Abiding Christ.

T. TEIGNMOUTH-SHORE, M.A.

**SAINT GEORGE FOR ENGLAND, and other Sermons Preached to Children.** By T. TEIGNMOUTH-SHORE, M.A., Canon of Worcester Cathedral, Chaplain-in-Ordinary to the King. Crown 8vo, cloth, 3s. net.

CONTENTS:—St. George for England—The King's Garden—Dreaming and Doing—The Good Fight—Flowers—The Ass—Lingering Lot—Slaves—An Example—Two Ways—Serving the Lord with One Shoulder—The Man with the One Talent—Doing What We Like—Doing Right—Doing Good—The Pattern of Childhood—The Saviour of Others—Christ is Risen—Tongues of Fire—The Bible—The English Bible.

---

LONDON:

FRANCIS GRIFFITHS, 34 MAIDEN LANE, STRAND, W.C.

# THE MEN OF THE BIBLE:

## THEIR LIVES AND TIMES.

17 Volumes, Crown 8vo, bound in cloth. Price per Volume,  
**2s. 6d. net.**

**ABRAHAM: His Life and Times.** By the Rev. W. J. DEANE, M.A. 2s. 6d. net.

"This book has the great merit of throwing on the life of Abraham all the light of recent Oriental learning, and therefore of making an entirely fresh figure of him, and one that harmonises with his contemporaries and environment."—*Evangelist*.

"As the first volume of a series entitled 'Men of the Bible,' we have an interesting and carefully written account of 'Abraham: his Life and Times,' by the Rev. W. J. Deane, M.A. The biblical record of the career of the patriarch is faithfully followed, but is elucidated by Mr. Deane from the results of modern scientific research and archæological discovery, and the book embodies a great amount of instructive information in an acceptable form."—*Scotsman*.

**DANIEL: His Life and Times.** By the Rev. H. DEANE, B.D. 2s. 6d. net.

"It makes the life of Daniel and his surroundings realities in a new sense. No Bible scholar ought to try to do without it."—*Standard*.

"The 'Men of the Bible' series, which we have had again and again to commend as being specially useful to our teachers, giving them the latest information and opinion on their respective subjects."—*Sunday School Chronicle*.

**DAVID: His Life and Times.** By the Rev. W. J. DEANE, M.A. 2s. 6d. net.

"The story of the romantic life, from cabin to palace, is told in simple, graceful style, giving a very distinct impression of his life and character."—*Advance*.

"These are very useful manuals for biblical students and Sunday School teachers."—*Daily Chronicle*.

**ELIJAH: His Life and Times.** By the Rev. Professor W. MILLIGAN, D.D. 2s. 6d. net.

"A charming addition to the series. . . . A strong, interesting, and useful book, which should be read, while its literary execution and finish commend it to all."—*Episcopal Recorder*.

"It would be difficult to say which of the volumes in this series is the best. This volume takes its place with the others as a valuable number of a most excellent set of books."

**EZRA AND NEHEMIAH.** By the Rev. Canon GEORGE RAWLINSON, M.A. 2s. 6d. net.

"An enlightened dissertation upon two great Jewish leaders. This little volume, which has evidently been most conscientiously prepared, is very suggestive."—*Daily Chronicle*.

"Displaying much ability, great learning, and sound judgment."—*Church Review*.

"No man living is better qualified to write on this subject than the Oxford professor of Ancient History."—*Onward*.

"Worthy of becoming a classic in its subject."—*Literary Churchman*.

"We strongly commend this book to the reading of every Protestant. Briefly, clearly, and trustworthily the narrative of the return from the Exile and of the subsequent incidents is detailed. It was a period of immense moment, and these two rulers, Ezra and Nehemiah, were, under God, the chief actors in those memorable scenes."—*Rock*.

## THE MEN OF THE BIBLE—*Continued.*

### GIDEON AND THE JUDGES: Their Lives and Times.

A Study, Historical and Practical. By the Rev. JOHN MARSHALL LANG, D.D. 2s. 6d. net.

"By means of an animated style, ample literary lore, and a reverent yet powerful grasp of divine truth, Dr. Lang has here produced a commentary on an epoch of Jewish history fertile in striking situations, which, though profoundly thoughtful, will secure the gratified attention of almost any reader in almost any mood of mind."—*Church Review.*

"It is a very interesting work, attractive in style, thoughtful, scholarly, practical, and abounding in instruction. Dr. Lang shows conspicuous ability in grappling with special difficulties, and has added a valuable contribution to the literature of the Old Testament."—*Methodist Recorder.*

"Here we have a feast for half a crown. If the book be estimated by the number of sermons to be got out of it, one has a great bargain."—*Sword and Trowel.*

### ISAAC AND JACOB: Their Lives and Times. By the

Rev. Canon GEORGE RAWLINSON, M.A. 2s. 6d. net.

"The canon has made his book an interesting one, and does full justice to his theme. His style is flowing, at times rising to eloquence."—*Literary World.*

"Canon Rawlinson is on his own ground, and brings his vast stores of Oriental learning to bear on a period and on characters about which commentators and preachers have left much to be said."—*Methodist Times.*

"A captivating story of the two patriarchal lives. Give us a day at the seaside, and either this volume or the same author's 'Kings of Israel and Judah,' and we will envy no monarch on his throne of ivory."—*Sword and Trowel.*

### ISAIAH: His Life and Times. By the Rev. Canon S. R.

DRIVER, M.A., D.D. 2s. 6d. net.

"A careful reading of this work by Professor Driver is fitted to add greatly to one's interest in the study of the book of Isaiah."—*Advance.*

"Cheaply issued, but written up to the latest information on their respective subjects, this series of Scripture biographies is of unusual interest to Sunday Schools."—*Sunday School Chronicle.*

### JEREMIAH: His Life and Times. By the Rev. Canon

T. K. CHEYNE, D.D. 2s. 6d. net.

"An ideal volume, which brings the history and the book vividly before the reader in a simple, picturesque manner, and yet leaves none of the religious elements out of account."—*Independent.*

"Preachers of all sorts and conditions may derive no little benefit from many suggestive passages."—*Church Times.*

### JESUS CHRIST THE DIVINE MAN. By the Rev. J. F.

VALLINGS, M.A. 2s. 6d. net.

"This piece of work bears examination, and grows on one. . . . We believe the divine blessing he asks for will be bestowed upon his efforts, and that the book will become a favourite with appreciative readers."—*Churchman.*

"We are more and more impressed with the value of the service rendered to religion by its publishers and editor. Excellent alike in design and execution, these handy half-crown volumes are calculated to be of immense service to young students and Christian workers. They are just the thing for the shelves of a Sunday School teacher's or local preacher's library."—*Methodist Recorder.*

### JOSHUA: His Life and Times. By the Rev. W. J. DEANE,

M.A. 2s. 6d. net.

"These books are easy as well as engaging reading, being written not for biblical students and scholars any more than for the general reader."—*Christian Intelligencer.*

"The imposing 'Men of the Bible' series."—*Critical Review.*



## THE MEN OF THE BIBLE—*Continued.*

### THE KINGS OF ISRAEL AND JUDAH. By the Rev. Canon GEORGE RAWLINSON, M.A. 2s. 6d. net.

"It would be difficult to give a more complete and readable account of all these kings. It would, perhaps, be impossible to find any one better qualified for the task than Canon Rawlinson."—*Week.*

"Canon Rawlinson has added yet another volume to that useful series, 'Men of the Bible,' which cannot fail to throw much light on those bygone days, and help the Bible student to understand better the character and work of these eminent men."—*John Bull.*

### THE MINOR PROPHETS. By Dean FARRAR, D.D. 2s. 6d. net.

"Its pages bristle with references to the critics and interpreters of the Old Testament. The book is packed with information, which is presented with consummate literary skill. The reader who has his English Bible open will find many a crooked place made straight and rough place plain."—*Critical Review.*

"His book will take its place among the works which must be read by all who wish to understand these interesting and precious writings."—*Leeds Mercury.*

### MOSES: His Life and Times. By the Rev. Canon GEORGE RAWLINSON, M.A. 2s. 6d. net.

"As easy to read as a story-book. Its information is wonderful. Our author makes Moses live before your eyes. Such is the writer's acquaintance with Eastern history, manners, and scenery, that he becomes the Macaulay of Moses, only without the inaccuracy of our English historian. This is grand change for half a crown. If the other 'Men of the Bible' find such biographers, the publishers will have to enlarge their premises. Friend, *buy this book.* We believe you will thank us for the advice when you find yourself fairly fascinated by it."—*Sword and Trowel.*

### SAMUEL AND SAUL. By the Rev. W. J. DEANE, M.A. 2s. 6d. net.

"Treated with adequate learning, a command of the best authorities, and excellent judgment."—*Watchman.*

"From personal experience we know that these books are liked by the thoughtful working-man, and we are sure the present volume will only strengthen their popularity."—*John Bull.*

### SOLOMON: His Life and Times. By Dean FARRAR, D.D. 2s. 6d. net.

"... Such a magnificent word-picture of the great king, that one rises from it with a more vivid idea of the Royal Preacher than one is likely to obtain by any other means. The cost is only half a crown; the literary taste and skill and learning are worth a thousand crowns at the least."—*Sword and Trowel.*

"These books form part of the fine 'Men of the Bible' series written by the ablest scholars of Great Britain. Of Dean Farrar it may be said, 'he touched nothing which he did not adorn.' He makes that old past lucid and luminous with light and throbbing with life."—*Onward.*

### ST. PAUL: His Life and Times. By Rev. Professor JAMES IVERACH, M.A., D.D. 2s. 6d. net.

"The judicious reader will count himself happy to fall in with a book on St. Paul written by a thoroughly competent person, who is neither the slave of his own antiquarian knowledge, nor of the historic or unhistoric imagination, nor even of the Tübingen theory. The author has mastered the most recent studies of his subject, both critical and theological, but he maintains the independence of his own mind, and with it a satisfactory sense of the true proportions of things. He goes fairly and honestly to work on the materials supplied by the New Testament, and those who are best acquainted with the ground will most admire the skill and solidity with which his narrative is compacted. The book is admirable, far truer, in its appreciation of the relative importance of events, than many larger works. It is manly and earnest."—*British Weekly.*

LONDON: FRANCIS GRIFFITHS. 34 MAIDEN LANE, STRAND, W.C.

# CRICKET SCORES, NOTES, Etc.

From 1730-1773.

Written as Reported in the different newspapers. To which are added Two Poems, with remarks, published in 1773, on Kent *v.* Surrey, also Rules of the Game when Betting was permitted. Compiled by H. T. WAGHORN. With a Frontispiece reproduction of an Engraving dated 1787, entitled "Representation of the noble game of Cricket, as played in the celebrated Cricket Field near White Conduit House."

*Crown 8vo, cloth, 6s.*

---

## Plain Principles of Prose Composition.

By Professor WILLIAM MINTO.

*Cloth, 1s. net.*

Chap. I. General Considerations : Introductory—The Fundamental Principle—The Starting Point—The Body of the Composition and the Method of Procedure. Chap. II. The Structure of Sentences and Paragraphs—Overcrowded Sentences—Right Words in Right Places—Arrangement of Sentences—Paragraph Method — Balanced Structure — Periodic Structure — The Climax. Chap. III. Figures of Speech : Meaning of "Figure" —Interrogation—Exclamation—Apostrophe—Vision—Personification—Hyperbole—Irony—Innuendo—Epigram—Similes and Metaphors—Metonymics. Chap. IV. Concluding Remarks : Meaning of Earnestness—Saxon and Latin Words—Simplicity must be Relative—Purity of Style—Character.

"A little book full of indispensable hints for authors and public speakers."

---

LONDON :

FRANCIS GRIFFITHS, 34 MAIDEN LANE, STRAND, W.C.

# The Institutes of the Law of Nations.

A Treatise on the Jural Relations of Separate  
Political Communities.

By JAMES LORIMER, LL.D.

*In Two Volumes. Demy 8vo, 16s. 6d. net.*

*Purchased separately; Vol. I., 7s. 6d.; Vol. II., 9s.*

Book I. Of the Sources of the Law of Nations.—Book II. Of the Recognition of State-Existence as the Fundamental Doctrine of the Law of Nations.—Book III. Of the Normal Relations of States.—Book IV. Of the Abnormal Jural Relations of Political Entities.—Book V. The Ultimate Problem of International Jurisprudence.

---

## The Trumpeter.

A Romance of the Rhine.

By JOSEPH VICTOR VON SCHEFFEL.

Translated from the Two Hundredth German Edition by JESSIE  
BECK and LOUISE LORIMER.

With an Introduction by Sir THEODORE MARTIN, K.C.B.

*Long 8vo, 3s. 6d. net.*

“No German poet is more original. . . . But most original and most charming of all is the humour.”—*Pall Mall Gazette*.

“No modern poetical work in any other country of the world has reached so great a position, and readers of this delightful rendering will readily understand the reason. . . . It is spontaneous and fresh, and gives one the feeling that it must have been created in the open air.”—*Glasgow Herald*.

“One of the most delightful romances ever written. . . . The spirit of the time breathes in the poem; but its main charm is in its treatment of the love-story.”—*Scotsman*.

---

LONDON :

FRANCIS GRIFFITHS, 34 MAIDEN LANE, STRAND, W.C.

# Paganism and Christianity.

By J. A. FARRER.

*Crown 8vo, cloth, pp. xviii and 256. Price 3s. 6d. net.*

CONTENTS :—Introductory.—I. Pagan Monotheism.—II. Pagan Theology.—III. Pagan Religion.—IV. Pagan Superstition.—V. The Pagan Belief in Heaven.—VI. The Pagan Belief in Hell.—VII. The End of the World.—VIII. Pagan Philosophy.—IX. Pagan Morality.—X. Christianity and Civilisation.—Conclusion.

---

## OPINIONS OF THE PRESS.

“The writer of this singularly able book wins the attention of his readers at once by his very lucid style and his manifest earnestness. From the first page to the last an unflagging interest is maintained, and one does not know whether to admire most the candour and the courage or the scholarship and intelligence to which the book bears witness. Mr. Farrer says at the outset: ‘The conviction under which the following pages were written, and which they are meant to enforce, is, that the triumph over Paganism of that type of Christianity which issued from the cauldron of theological strife as the only really orthodox form; which became stereotyped in Roman Catholicism; which produced the Crusades, the Religious Orders, and the Inquisition; and which is now striving to assert its blighting supremacy over Protestant Christianity, has been, not a gain, but a misfortune, to the world, and has retarded rather than promoted civilisation.’ There are persons who would turn with alarm from a book introduced by such words as these, but . . . the reactionary tendency in the present day towards mere priestcraft is again reducing the higher Christianity to inferior and unspiritual levels, in view of which it is well to be reminded, not only of the supreme spirituality of Christ, but also of those almost faultless types of moral virtue in combination with great intelligence which belong to the old world, and shame this latest age of the new world. Mr. Farrer renders us this service.”—*Yorkshire Herald*.

“There is much that is valuable in this book, and we are pleased to have so much evidence put before us in a compact form in regard to pagan teaching.”—*Scottish Pulpit*.

“Mr. Farrer has written an original and delightful book, in which he has successfully cleared paganism from the libellous aspersions of the Fathers.”—*Westminster Review*.

“The fruit of extensive reading, the author puts his arguments fairly, reasonably, and temperately, and in English of sound literary quality.”—*Birmingham Daily Post*.

---

LONDON: FRANCIS GRIFFITHS, 34 MAIDEN LANE, STRAND, W.C.





BX Hutton, Arthur Wollaston, 1848-1912.  
5133 Ecclesia discens : occasional sermons and  
H9 addresses / by Arthur Wollaston Hutton. --  
E3 London : F. Griffiths, 1904.  
viii, 166p. ; 20cm.

1. Church of England--Sermons. I. Title.

CCSC/mmb

A25640

725870

